This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 07024125 6

BIBLE

DEFENCE OF SLAVERY;

AND

ORIGIN FORTUNES, AND HISTORY

OF THE

NEGRO RACE.

BY REV. JOSIAH PRIEST, A.M.

FIFTH EDITION—STEREOTYPED.

GLASGOW, KY.,
PUBLISHED BY REV. W. S. BROWN, M.D.
1852.

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE.

In presenting the following work to the American public, no apologies are offered. We live under a Government which tolerates liberty of thought and freedom of the press, and in this expression of our honest views and feelings upon a subject relating to the general welfare of the country, we are but exercising a right which belongs to every American citizen. Observation and experience has taught us, that no man's opinions and principles gain favor with the world by empty apologies and useless excuses; but, that they are generally received or rejected, as they should be, according as they possess merit or demerit. It is a pleasing reflection, that the age of proscription for opinion's sake, is past, we trust, never again to return; and that the unrestricted interchange of thought and sentiment, which is permitted by the liberal genius of

our free institutions, has been productive of the most glorious results—as the rapid spread of civilization and Christianity, the general diffusion of light and knowledge, and the wonderful developments and triumphs of science and art, in this our day and generation, clearly demonstrate. Let the work progress—let the little stone cut from the mountain's brow, continue to roll onward, gathering strength with its progress—the result will be the full development of the illimitable powers of the human mind, and a final consummation of all the glorious events contemplated in the redemption of the world.

The question, "Is slavery, as it exists in the United States, justifiable?" is one which, at least, admits of discussion. If it be in harmony with the immutable principles of truth and justice, and not a "crime against humanity," and a libel upon our holy religion, let it be so understood and practised by our honest citizens, whose highest ambition consists in faithfully serving God, and living in obedience to the laws of the country. If not, let the converse be established, and some judicious and *practicable* system of emancipation and removal provided; and we maintain, without the fear of successful refutation, that a majority of the enlightened slaveholders of the United States, with characteristic promptitude and Christian philanthropy, will liberate their slaves, and contribute to their removal and future support and protection. All that is wanted in the final adjustment of this "vexed question," is light and knowledge—a fair and

candid interchange of thoughts and opinions—a faithful and true exposition of the principles involved in the relation of master and slave. Convince the slaveholder that this relation is incompatible with Christianity and republicanism—he stands ready to abandon it, regardless of the sacrifice. His mind is not sealed against the impressive teaching of truth and reason, nor his heart seared against the moving influences of pure benevolence and true Christian charity. But, hitherto, the agitation of this question has been altogether one-sided, and confined mainly to those in whose action upon this subject, neither right, reason, nor justice, were involved. They have been justly regarded as busy-bodies, and disturbers of the public peace. The question, like the institution itself, is purely of a sectional or local character, involving only the interests of the citizens of those States where slavery exists. For it to be discussed and agitated, and the motives and characters of the slaveholder to be assailed and calumniated by the citizens of other States is illiberal and anti-republican, and savours of ignorance and corruption, or of both combined. But, nevertheless, this unnatural warfare against truth and justice, against law and liberty, has been continued, until the peace and prosperity of a great nation are much disturbed, and our glorious Confederacy well nigh dissolved; until many of our best citizens and purest patriots have began almost to call in question the honesty of the honored dead—the Fathers of the Republic; and to look with distrust and

suspicion upon those time-honored institutions which have commanded the world's admiration, and by which are secured to us the richest blessings of civil and religious liberty. Is it not time, then, that the South should begin to defend herself against the aggressions of these time-serving votaries of error and fanaticism, and show to the world that her peculiar policy and institutions *are* in harmony with the genius of republicanism, and the spirit of true Christianity? Believing that such is her true policy, and that this proposition is much more consistent and reasonable, as well as more easily established than its converse, we have been induced to give publicity to the following pages in vindication of *Southern rights and institutions.*

Although we believe that the institution of slavery received "the sanction of the Almighty in the Patriarchal age;" "that it was incorporated into the only national constitution which ever emanated from God;" "that its legality was recognized, and its relative duties regulated by our Saviour, when upon earth;" that it was established in wisdom, and has been wisely continued through all ages, and handed down to us in mercy; and that the relation of master and servant harmonizes strictly with the best interests of the inferior or African race in particular, in securing to him that protection and support which his native imbecility of intellect disqualifies him from securing for himself; yet do we most cordially reprobate any abuse of the relation by the superior

power, or any undue exercise of authority, by the master over the slave—holding it to be an unwavering, uncompromising truth, that a fearful retribution is in reservation for all the violators of the wisely-established decrees of God, in this respect. There are certain obligations and duties which every master owes to his slave, that are as binding and indispensable as are the duties and obligations which he owes to his God, his country, or himself. These discharged, in accordance with the will of high Heaven, and the mere fact of being a slaveholder will not, in our humble judgment, debar a man from an entrance into that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

Our individual views on the subject of a national system of colonization, as applicable to the FREE BLACK population of the United States, may be regarded, at first sight, perhaps, as somewhat novel, and wanting in the essential qualities of age and precedent, or experience; but the reader may rest assured, that they have been submitted to the inspection of many of our prominent citizens and leading statesmen, and have received their unqualified approval, without exception. The existence of free blacks in any community, whether free or slave, is universally admitted to be an evil of no minor consideration. Their removal, therefore, is a matter deeply affecting the interests and well-being of both races. Their present number and natural increase, places this beyond the reach of individual enterprise. The resources of the general government must, therefore, be brought

into requisition in the removal of this, as well as any other evil of a general or national character. How this may be done in this case, in a manner harmonizing with the true interests of both races, is a theme certainly not unworthy the candid consideration of any American citizen.

In the work of Mr. Priest, on the subject of "Slavery, as it relates to the Negro, or African Race, Examined in the Light of Circumstances, History, and the Holy Scriptures; with an Account of the Black Man's Color, Causes of his State of Servitude, and Traces of his Character, as well in Ancient as in Modern Times, with Strictures on Abolitionism," the reader may confidently expect to find a work of great research and ability—one of deep interest, and well worthy his candid perusal. The author has sought, in the oracles of God, in authentic history, and in the analogies of nature, the key to the mystery of the degradation, through the unchronicled ages of the past, of the negro race. The fact of the inferiority and consequent subordination of the black race to the white, being in accordance with the will of the Supreme Ruler of the universe, is not like a mathematical problem, susceptible of absolute demonstration; yet we think the readers of this work will acknowledge that the author has let in a flood of light upon this deeply interesting subject, through the mist in which ignorance and misguided sympathy has enveloped it. Himself a Northern man, prejudiced, as he admits, in his early

education, against the institution, the conclusion at which he arrives, supported as they are by the most powerful train of reasoning, cannot fail to check the suicidal progress of that pseudo-philanthropy, yclept "modern abolitionism."

Glasgow, Ky., April 27th, 1850.

PREFACE.

THAN a knowledge of the races and nations of men, who have peopled the globe since it was created, there can be no subject more interesting. With a view to an elucidation of this description, we present the work before us, in which an attempt is made to give, in some measure, a history of the *origin*, *character*, and *fortunes*, of the negro portion of mankind.

In pursuit of this object we hope there needs no apology, because we have found it necessary to resort to the Holy Scriptures for much important information which relates to our design, as it is well known that those parts of that book which were written by Moses are the *eldest* writings of the human race now extant, and relate to the very *first* operations of the human race after the flood. As corroboratory of the developments of that miraculous book, we have also resorted to ancient and modern history, to travels, narratives, &c., which go to aid us in the research.

As to the *origin* of the negro man, we have, in our cogitations, recollected several curious opinions relative to the subject, which we have thought proper to present, on account of their wild and extravagant character, as follows:

Some have queried, whether the *mother* of the *first* negro man might not have been *frightened* by some hideous black monster of the antediluvian woods—as in the first ages of the world there were many terrible beasts of the wilderness roaming about, whose races are now extinct. There is *one* creature which existed *then*, and is not yet extinct, whose appearance, in its native haunts, is very frightful to behold; and this is the black ourang-outang, of which animal there are individuals known to have attained the enormous height

of seven feet, covered entirely with shining black hair. The strange effects of fright on the offspring of mothers, is a well known phenomenon in the physiological history of man. Thus, as some have supposed, the negro race was produced, forming an entire *new* class of human beings, and distinguished from the nature, color, and character of the parents, by a fright of the mother.

Others have seemed to believe, that, in the very first ages of the planet, and long before the creation of *Adam*, there existed a race of animals, having a resemblance to man, as has the ourang-outang, but of gigantic stature, as well as power, dwelling in communion with other beasts and monsters of that time. From *this* family of animals, it has been supposed that the negro race was *derived*, and brought forward by the continual mutations of nature, passing from one change to another in pursuit of maturity, with all things else, arriving at last to their highest point, as exhibited in the presence of the black or negro nations.

It has also been believed, that, at a very early period of time, some community of men have been so situated, in relation to *climate*, food, and other circumstances, as to have been changed from their original stamp of complexion and character, to that of perfect blacks, thus originating the negro family of man.

Some have imagined, that the origin of the race was a *disease* of the *skin*, which, being of an incurable nature, formed at length a *radical* character, and thus produced this people.

Many have believed, that there was at *first* as many *fathers* and *mothers* created as there are now different races of men, from whom have descended the *red*, the *white*, the *black*, the *brown*, and the yellow tribes of the human race, discarding the account given in the Scriptures of there having been but *one* pair of human beings created.

Others have imagined, that the mark set upon *Cain* by the Divine Power, for the crime of *homicide*, was that of *jet*, which not only changed the color of his body, but extended to the blood and the whole of his physical being, thus originating the negro race, a remnant of which they suppose, by means of some craft, or rather outrode the flood, anchoring on some lofty mountain, subsisting on the floating carcasses of the drowned animals till the earth was dried again.

Thus many have mused on the subject of the origin of the negro race. But we reject all these schemes as the baseless hallucinations of vissionaries, even the mooted and equally absurb problem that *climate*, or any other contingency, became the origin of that people, and affirm that a cause of an entire different description from all these gave birth to the race, an account of which we shall give in the work.

As to the mental character of the black nations, considered collectively, we have found them, in all ages, since their appearance on the earth, of but small account when compared with the other races of men, the *red* and *white*.

In publishing our opinions, as presented in this work, we have been moved thereto, by the operations of conflicting principles, as held by *abolitionists* and anti-abolitionists, throughout the entire United States, believing that light was necessary, in order to learn the *truth* respecting the people in question, namely, the negro race.

We are also anxious to ascertain the *cause* of this class of mankind being enslaved, in the *low* and *degraded* sense of the word.

As to the history of the black portion of the human race it has occupied the pens of more writers than *one;* on which account we feel that we are not alone in this attempt, and, also, that we have advanced some *new*, and not uninteresting,

opinions, with respect to the *time* and the *occasion* of the production of the first negro man.

Together with an account of the *origin* of this people, we have not forgotten to inquire something respecting the native mental abilities of the race, and whether created equal in *that* and *other* particulars with other men. We have, also, had something to say about exalting them in this country to *political* and *social* equality with the other citizens of the United States, and whether, were the whites and blacks to become amalgamated, it would be a desirable object, with many other matters of interest.

We have found the history of this race somewhat of a difficult character to describe, as it is far more hidden and obscure than the history of either the *red* or *white* race; yet we believe that some progress, in this respect, is made in the work.

Thus, with but few prefatory remarks, we submit our opinions, believing that which we have advanced to be indubitable, however repugnant to the conceptions of many, who fancy they see in the negro's *mind* the *germs* of a *prodigious mental power*, notwithstanding all the evidence to the contrary, which has witnessed against them for thousands of years, showing that a pall of darkness and obscurity, not occasioned by the acts or the influence of the other races, has rested on the whole being of this people, induced *by a higher* power than that of man.

As was the *deep*, when nature first was made,
And earth's foundations in the waters laid—
When darkness reign'd, the realm of ancient night,
When God sent forth his Word, and there was light;
So is the race of Ham, a darkling sea,
Which now invites the truth, that *light* may be,
O'er which, if we have sent a single *ray*,
Then have we gain'd our aim, and look for day.

THE AUTHOR.

INDEX.

FIRST SECTION.

Complexion of the Parents of the Human Race; Kind of earth Man was made of; Power of the Hebrew Language in giving Names; Adam and Eve both called *Adam* by the Creator; Complexion of the Antediluvians; Curious Chronology of the Holy Seed, from Adam to Jacob, the immediate Head of the Jewish Tribes; The opinions of some that Adam was created black, refuted; Personal Appearance of Adam and Eve, in Paradise, before the Fall; With many other Curious Matters,.....15

SECOND SECTION.

Origin of the Negro Race; Argument to ascertain this; Causes of the great varieties of Human Complexion; Doctrine of Climates and Local Causes to produce such varieties refuted; Impossibility of Human Parents producing any other complexion than their own without a miracle; Proofs that white, black and red men are found in the hottest regions of the globe, and have been thus in the same latitudes for thousands of years; No Negroes on the earth till many hundred years after Adam's creation; The precise time of their origin, when and where; No climate forms, or causes the *origin* of human characters; Birth of the first white man, when and where; No white man on the earth till many hundred years after Adam's creation; Argument to ascertain this; The Hebrew Language that of Adam, as well as of Noah and the Patriarchs; Meaning of the word *Ham;* Of *Japheth* and *Shem:* Reasons why God produced men of different constitutions and colors than had the first man; With many other curious matters,.....25

THIRD SECTION.

Adaptation of *men* and animals to the countries and circumstances of their being; Early settlements of the first nations after the flood; Three races of men, black, red and white, in the family of Noah; Great difference between the formations of the bodies of white men and negroes; reasons why the skulls of black men are thicker than those of the whites; These differences noticed by ancient Historians; Negroes not as liable to infectious diseases as

white men; interesting notice by Herodotus, respecting the heads of negro men; Curious formation of their feet; Reasons why Extraordinary fact respecting the Negro's skin being filled with myriads of little cups of water; The reasons why; With many other curious matters,.....47

FOURTH SECTION.

Proof of the existence of the Negro race too near the time of Noah, and in his neighborhood, to allow of the doctrine of climate to have been the cause of this; Remarks of David in the Book of Psalms, on this subject; In the Book of Chronicles on this subject; In the Book of Genesis on this subject; Names of all the sons of Ham, the first Negro; The countries they settled, after the ruin of the Tower of Nimrod; respecting the color of the Egyptians; Herodotus's account of this matter, as well as of the color of all Africans of his age; Proofs that they were always black, from the very beginning of their existence; Curious account of the wife of Moses; Proofs of her being a Negress, and of the race of Ham; Statement of the prophet Jeremiah, that Ethiopians were black; If the three sons of Noah were all of the same complexion, then follow certain results, fatal to the veracity of the Scriptures; Hercules; Was Nimrod the grandson of Noah, and the origin of all the fabled Herculeses of all the early nations; Some curious traditions of African authority, respecting their own origin; With many other curious matters,.....54

FIFTH SECTION.

The three sons of Noah, all born more than a hundred years before the Flood, aided in building the Ark; Reasons why the Divine Being produced two new races of men different from Adam; Change of the climates of the Globe effected by the Flood; Beauty of the earth before the Flood; Wife of Ham and the wives of the other sons of Noah; Who they were; Respecting straight-haired black men; The cause, Ham, their father having been woolly-headed; Egyptian mummies; One man only between Noah and Adam; Landing of the Ark on a mountain; Noah descends; Plants a vineyard; Drinks new wine; Falls asleep; Ham's conduct on the occasion; Noah's curse of the whole race of Ham; Description of Mount Ararat; The first tents of Noah; Early settlements at the foot of the mountain; *Plate* of the family of Noah, showing the different complexions of his sons; Arguments and reasons against the amalgamation of the races at first; Arguments that Noah's *curse* of Ham was God's *judicial decree* that slavery was thus entailed upon the Negro race; Character of Ham, from his youth till the curse; Argument that the *curse* was not a mere prophesy, but a decree *judicial*,.....76

SIXTH SECTION.

Proofs from the Scriptures, that the *curse* of Noah upon the race of Ham, as a *judicial* act, is *indorsed* by the law of Moses; Comparative view of all the orders of servants among the Jews, as the *hired* Hebrew servant, the *bought* Hebrew servant, the *voluntary* Hebrew servant, and the Negro or Canaanite slave; Remarks on the subject of the *strangers*, of whom the Jews *might* take usury, and of whom they might *not* take usury; Respecting who the strangers were, who they should not enslave, or use as bondmen; A seeming contradiction in the law on this subject reconciled; Perpetual slaves to be bought of the Negro heathen of old Canaan, as directed by the law; Strictures on Abolitionist opinions, respecting the meaning of the law relative to servants; Character of Noah and Lot rescued from abolitionist aspersions; Strictures on the opinions of abolitionists, respecting the word BUY, as applied to the purchase of *bondmen*, in the law of Moses, with other matters of their setting forth; Difference between the condition of *Hebrew* servants and their Canaanite slaves, with respect to the *jubilees*, and other matters; Proofs that the Hebrews bought and sold Negro slaves under the sanction of the law—even going to Africa for that purpose; Enslaving of the persons of the Amalekites under the eye of Moses; slaves of the Patriarchs bought with money; A curious query of abolitionists answered; With many other matters,.....106

SEVENTH SECTION

Arguments and positions of abolitionists favoring a belief that the Scriptures recognize the negro man as being equal with the other races, in point of blood and otherwise, refuted; Mark of Cain; What it was; No black men or negroes before the flood except one; Difference between the secreting power of the blood of white and negro men; Evidences that the Supreme Being puts a higher estimate on white than on black, as colors or complexions; Consent to this difference by the blacks themselves, though incidentally given, according to the accounts of travelers in Africa; A curious argument of abolitionists in favor of negro equality replied to, with many other interesting matters,.....160

EIGHTH SECTION.

Moral and civil character of the negro race; Acts of the negro Sodomites; Their lewdness, &c.; Proofs from many authors respecting their amours with dumb beasts; As well from the Scriptures; Of this the Canaanites were guilty; as well as the Egyptians; Moses's testimony to this; Herodotus's testimony from his own observations when in Egypt; *Gales's* testimony, *Sonnini's* testi-

mony; Testimony of the Prophet Ezekiel; Curious sexual formation of the negro race; Lewd customs of the ancient Egyptians about their temples, as seen by Herodotus; Some traits of character among the negroes of all countries at the present time, in America, and everywhere; Dreadful practices of the *women* of Egypt; Writer's apology for plain writing on matters of this description; Proofs that Jezebel and all her priests were black, with some account of her character as a negress and a wanton; account of automaton images made for lewd purposes by the women of those times; Pictures and images of the Canaanites; Influence of these doings of the negroes of those ages on the Hebrews; Curious reason of the Jewish Rabbi why the dogs would not eat the head and hands of Jezebel; Horrid customs of the African negroes; Respecting the marriages of their young women, as related by Herodotus; Corresponding character of the Africans *now* in these particulars, as related by travelers; Rollin's testimony to the same thing, ...174

NINTH SECTION.

Pretended *mental* equality of the negro race with white men refuted, as held by abolitionists; Comparative view of the races, as to their doings in the world; Proofs that the ancient Egyptians, nor any of the negro nations, were not the authors of either arts or sciences; Proofs that the arts and sciences, comprehending a knowledge of letters, were known before the flood, and in the house of Noah, and by the first patriarchs; Curious discoveries made in the foundations of the tower of Babel by Sir Robert Ker-Porter; A knowledge of letters since the flood derived from the first patriarchs, and not from the Phœnician blacks; but little advances made in architecture by the first Egyptians, till after Solomon; The pyramids built by the shepherd kings, a race of copper-colored men of the blood of Shem, and not by the blacks of Egypt; For thousands of years the tribes of Africa have made no advances in civilization; The *reasons* of this; Works of the Canaanites, as it related to architecture, derived from the Euphrates, or the example of the Shemites, and the people of Japheth; During the whole history of negro Carthage, they made no advances in literature; Rapine, plunder, and dealing in slaves, being their trade; Architectural works of the races of Shem and Japheth long before the tower was built, or the negroes exit to Africa; Near resemblance of the Simia race as the ourang-outang, and many of the Africans; Respecting their appetites; Cannibalism, &c., in all ages; Insensibilities of the negroes to bodily pain; Meanness of the negro spirit; Their cruelties to their slaves; With many other curious matters,.....203

TENTH SECTION.

The subject of the amalgamation of the white and negro races examined; which event, by some men, seems to be greatly desired; The voice of God, in nature, against it; Horrid results, were the amalgamation of the races to become universal; Lowering of the present standard of the powers of the human mind; Changes in the physical formation of the human body, as extant in the nations of white men, in their approximation to the form of the ourang-outang, through the influence of negro amalgamation; Deterioration of the mental image of God, as given to the keeping of the white race; Negroes' brains found to be *less* in *weight* and *measure* than the white man's; Dodging of abolitionists on this question; Anticipations of some men that amalgamation will finally become universal, so as to put down slavery in this *way*; Slavery among the African negroes before they knew white men; Stealing each other; Murdering of children among them; Many facts respecting the near approach of various negro tribes to the form of the ourang-outang; Indifference to pain, when under surgical operations; Corresponding insensibility of the mind, with respect to the *moral* feelings of the *heart*, as well as to the sufferings of others; Cruelty to the aged and the sick; Pretended obsequiousness of some abolitionists to negroes, with a view, as they say, to their exaltation; *Natural* enmity between negroes and white men,.....250

ELEVENTH SECTION.

Inquiries whether the statements of Noah, respecting the race of Japheth, or the white nations, enslaving the descendants of Ham, have been fulfilled, and are now in progress to that effect; Number of the sons of Japheth; Their great power; Countries they settled at first; Nations now known of that progeny; First cities built by them, which was earlier than any of the others; Description of the first operations of men near Ararat, during Noah's lifetime after the flood; Respecting Melchisedek, who he was, which is in connection with the subject; Travels of Shem among the first settlements; Worship of *Baal*, or the fly god, now among the Africans; Nimrod and the wild beasts, with a plate; *Shem*, the son of Noah, was Melchisedek SHEM, the first city of mankind after the flood, built by the whites; First instances on a great scale of white men enslaving the race of Ham in *ancient* times, and respecting its continuance; Certainty of the fulfillment of God's decrees, and the veracity of the Scriptures; Strictures on the opinions of abolitionists; Their opposition to the Bible if it upholds slavery; Views of St. Paul respecting negro slavery, as set forth in the New Testament; Vast numbers of slaves in the Roman empire in St. Paul's time; Their dreadful condition; Curious opinion of abolitionists, as a reason why Christ did not reprove slavery; Nimrod and the tower, with other matters,....272

TWELFTH SECTION.

Inquiries whether the Scriptures have, either in the Old or New Testaments, abolished slavery, as abolitionists assert that they have; Query, if they never sanctioned it, how could they abolish it? The famous passage of *Isaiah*, chap. lviii, on which abolitionists found their argument in favor of the scriptural abolishment of slavery, examined, and found to have no allusion to the subject; all the Jews, their elders, nobles and kings, enslaved the race unreproved; Reproofs of the prophets, for the Jews enslaving their *own* people beyond the jubilees, but not the negroes; The famous passage of Exod. xxi, 16, which respects the *stealing* of a man to enslave, or to sell him, examined, and found to have no allusion to negroes, while abolitionists assert that it does; Isaiah's opinion respecting the Jews enslaving their enemies, chap. xiv, 2; Abolition argument against slavery, founded on the law of *love* toward our neighbor, replied to; Abolition argument, charging the institution of negro slavery with an attempt to usurp the *sovereignty* of God over the *souls* of slaves, replied to,.....320

THIRTEENTH SECTION.

A further exhibition of the opinions and doings of abolitionists in America; Consequences, if they carry their plans into effect; *Sympathy* is the lever by which they operate; Men should beware how they array themselves against the decrees of God; *Mysterious* providences of God toward man; Proposal to abolitionists, by the author, to assail *other* mysterious providences of God, as well as the one which respects negro servitude; Reckless opinions of abolitionists respecting the southern states; Effects of freeing the negroes in the British West India Islands; Effects, were the slaves of the southern states freed all at once; Proofs respecting the insincerity of English philanthropy toward enslaved negroes, and of their non-reliance upon the labor of freed slaves; Proofs of a suspicion that English vessels are now engaged in getting slaves from the interior of Africa, as formerly; Consequences, should the Union become divided on the slave question; Great possessions and power of the English all round America; Their designs; Intended possession of the Oregon territory; Cruelties of the English in India, where they have conquered; Coalescing of American abolitionists with the English, on the subject of American negro slavery, as shown in their speeches in London, with many other matters,.....350

FOURTEENTH SECTION.

Replies to various abolition questions proposed to the author; Circumstances in which men find themselves possessed of slaves beyond their control, which is held to be God's providence in se-

curing negro slavery, in agreement with his decree by Noah; Difference of negro sensibilities from that of the whites, on being separated from wives and children, proven by facts; Argument of abolitionists in favor of negro equality, founded on God's having given the rule of all animals, as much to the blacks as to the whites, replied to; Ham and Nimrod's opposition to the religion of Noah, founded on their hatred to him, on account of the *curse*, who originated idolatry in the world; None but negroes engaged in the project of the tower; Happiness and well-being of the negro race seem to lie in the direction of the white man's control; Fates of all the ancient negro kingdoms; Different estimate of the negro, respecting human liberty and its uses, from the white man; The races set out, after the flood, with equal opportunities, but who has won the prize? *Practical* undervaluing of the negro character by abolitionists; A curious position of abolitionists, which supposes the *hiring* out of the race of Ham to the other races would fulfill Noah's *curse*, replied to; a certain great objection of abolitionists to slavery, which charges owners of slaves of giving them no wages, replied to; The patriarch, nor did the Jew, pay slaves any wages as *hired* men, with many other matters,.....374

FIFTEENTH SECTION.

That the Gospel doctrines and their tendencies is against negro slavery, as asserted by abolitionists, shown to be a mistake; Examination of the golden rule of our Savior, in relation to this matter; That the condition of slaves among the Jews was a condition of comparative comfort, as is asserted by abolitionists, refuted; Care of slaves, as far back in time as the days of *Job* and *Abraham;* The subject of *judicial* law and the law of *love* examined, in relation to negro slavery, and are found to harmonize; The great and stronghold of abolitionism in support of negro equality, and the propriety of amalgamation by marriages, founded on God's striking *Miriam*, the sister of Moses, with leprosy, because she found fault with her brother for having married an Ethiopian woman, overturned and shown to be blasphemous; Curious fact of the blood of the negro race being guarded against, as affecting the blood of the line through which the Messiah was to come; *First* preaching of the Gospel directed to the *countries* inhabited by white men, not negroes; This was done afterward; All the present arts of the world nearly of white men's invention, not negroes', with many other deeply interesting subjects,.....396

ORIGIN

AND

HISTORY OF THE NEGRO RACE.

FIRST SECTION.

Complexion of the Parents of the Human Race—Kind of Earth Man was made of—Power of the Hebrew Language in giving Names—Adam and Eve both called *Adam* by the Creator—Complexion of the Antediluvians—Curious Chronology of the Holy Seed, from Adam to Jacob, the immediate Head of the Jewish Tribes—The opinions of some that Adam was created black, refuted—Personal Appearance of Adam and Eve, in Paradise, before the Fall—With many other curious matters.

THAT we may elucidate the subjects alluded to on the title page of this work, it is of importance to ascend very high toward the beginning of time in this investigation, even up to the creation of the first human pair. By this method, and this *only*, do we hope to arrive at length to a knowledge of the desired objects.

To ascertain the true origin of the Negro, or African race, at the very threshold of the work, is exceedingly appropriate, as, without *such* a discovery, we shall appear to wander where no light shines to illume the way, amidst the mazes of ancient times.

How often do we hear questions like the following? From whence came the Ethiopian, or black man?

Who was his father? Did he spring from Adam, or some other race? Can it be, that from one and the *same* source, the white, black and red portions of mankind proceeded, with all the hues and shades of complexion which mark the human race? If so, is it not exceedingly mysterious that there is not *now*, nor never *has* been, the occurrence of a variety so marked and distinctive, as is black, white and red, proceeding from the same parents *naturally*? Surely, if nature, in the beginning, or in the first ages, produced from the same origin different races of men, as to their complexions and physical constitutions, she ought to produce the same, in these later ages, in order to be consistent with herself in *this* particular, as she is known to be in all others. These are questions the first to arise, whenever this subject is referred to, by the inquisitive and the lovers of knowledge.

But as we pass in the prosecution of the work, we hope to answer the above queries, and show the reader the true origin of the negro race, as well as that of the others, the white and red—there having been, in reality, but these three on the earth, as the *yellow* and the *brown*, with all the other shades, are but derived from an amalgamation of the three others, which were *prior* and *radical*, as we shall show in due order.

On this subject, *nature*, or rather God *in* nature, has instructed us, that without the intervention of Divine *power*, there could, and never would have been, but *one* general complexion of the people of the globe, and that *one* complexion would have been

like the first parents, whatever that complexion was. If the first two of human kind were created white, they could never have been the parents of *black* and *red* men. If they were created *red*, they could never have been the parents of *black* and *white* men. If they were created *black*, they could never have been the parents of *white* and *red* men, as they could *naturally* procreate only their own complexion.

Since the creation of man upon the earth, there never was produced from the *same* parents a variety of complexion (except in the case of the Albino's production, which is *now* considered to be only the effect of disease); *this* particular, the producing of varieties, is a trait of the nature of beasts, but not of man, who, in *this* particular, are more fixed, being created in a way which has set him above the winds and the weather, as it relates to his physical being.

Here it is proper to inquire what then was the complexion of the two first of the human race, Adam and Eve, and the antediluvian world, their offspring?

In relation to this extremely curious, as well as interesting subject, we shall refer first to a very an cient, and a very learned historian, namely, FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, who says, in his work on the Antiquities of the Jews, Book i, p. 12, that *Adam*, the first man, was created *red*. The following are his words: "God took dust from the ground and formed man, and inserted in him a spirit and a soul. This man was called ADAM, which, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies one that is *red*, because he was formed of *red earth*, compounded together, for of that kind is *virgin* or true earth.

The kind of earth which Josephus calls *virgin*, or pure earth, was, no doubt, of a very peculiar character and appearance, or he would not have called it pure or virgin earth, in distinction from all the other earths of the globe, of which it is said, that there are *nine*. How this man came by a knowledge of this circumstance, we cannot tell, except he derived it from the term *Adam*, or from a tradition of the patriarchs arising out of that circumstance, his creation from red earth, and handed down from the house of Noah.

For this very reason, doubtless, it was written by Moses, Gen. v, 2, that God called the two parents of the human race by but *one* name, which was that of ADAM, in which name was comprehended, as well their *natures* as their complexion. God did not give the first woman the name of EVE; it was Adam who did *this*, when he saw that she was to become the mother of all the human race. ADAM was the name which God gave to the woman as well as to the man at *first*, as shown above from the text of Moses.

THIS circumstance should not be allowed to pass till it shall have made its due impression upon the mind of the reader, which is as follows: "*Male* and *female* created He them; and blessed them, and called *their* name Adam, in the day when they were created."

In accordance with this statement of Josephus, in rendering a reason *why* God called the two first human beings by but *one* name, and that name being *Adam*, or the *red* man and woman, we find that the Hebrew language establishes that the words *Adam*,

Adamah, *Adami*, and *Admah*, have all a similar meaning.

First—ADAM, as above, signifies earthy *man*, red; second—ADAMAH, signifies red earth, or blood; third—ADAMI, signifies my man red, earthy, *human;* fourth—ADMAH, signifies earthy, red, or *bloody;* all of which words are of the same class, and spring from the same root, which was *Adam*, signifying *red*, or copper color.

From a view of this fact, it is difficult to account for the reason of the name of the first man and woman, unless they were created *red*, instead of white or black, as it is well known that the Hebrew language is governed in its power of naming visible existences, as of animals, fowls, fishes, &c., by their appearances or natures, and frequently by both, as in the case of the name *Adam*, which not only represented the hue of his skin, but that *also* of his *intellectual* existence or *human* nature.

Thus this Jewish historian, as well as the *genius* of the Hebrew language, furnishes us with a clue, like the golden thread in the labyrinth of the subterranean palace of ancient Thebes, leading to the right conclusion on this subject, namely, that Adam, with all the antediluvian race, were *red*, or a copper colored people.

But on this subject there is other testimony corroborative of the above, though but incidentally afforded, and yet is of the highest possible authority. This evidence is found in the writings of Moses, in the book of Genesis, chapters *five* and *eleven*. In this book is written, by a competent hand, a brief, yet

perfect, history of the *cosmogony* of the earth, as well as a narrative of the births and deaths of the patriarchs, from the beginning to the time in which he lived, a lapse of years consisting of 2553, and about 1481 years before the birth of Josephus, who was a mere lad at the time of Christ's crucifixion.

This incidental evidence, in relation to the belief that Adam was created *red*, is afforded by Moses, in tracing the *genealogical* descent of *one* of the sons of Adam, namely, that of SETH, from his father down to the patriarch *Jacob*, who was the immediate progenitor of the twelve tribes of the house of Israel.

Now, as the Jews are *red*, or a dark copper colored race, in their pure and unamalgamated condition, aids in proving that Adam was also of the same complexion, because SETH, an *immediate* son of Adam and Eve, was the direct progenitor of the Hebrew, or Jewish people, commonly called the lineage of the holy seed. See Genesis, as above alluded to, v and xi; also, chapters xxi, xxv and xxxv, where the true genealogy of that race is traced out, coming down from *Adam* to *Noah*, then from Noah to *Abraham*, and from thence to *Jacob*, the head of the twelve tribes of the Jews.

To please the curious, we will give an extract from those chapters of the book of Gen. v, xi, xxi, xxv, xxxv, respecting this genealogy, which is as follows:

SETH, the son of Adam, was the father of ENOS, who was the father of CAINAN, who was the father of MAHALALEEL, who was the father of JARED, who was the father of ENOCH, who was the father of METHUSELAH, who was the father of LAMECH, who

was the father of NOAH, who was the father of SHEM, who was the father of ARPHAXAD, who was the father of SALAH, who was the father of EBER, who was the father of PELEG, who was the father of REU, who was the father of SERUG, who was the father of NAHOR, who was the father of TERAH, who was the father of ABRAHAM, who was the father of ISAAC, who was the father of JACOB, who was the father of the twelve tribes of ISRAEL. Thus the genealogy of the descent of the Jews is made out, and as it is well known that the Jews, in their pure and unamalgamated state, are *red*, or copper colored, we prove, by this fact, in connection with the foregoing evidence, that the antediluvians, with the father of the human race, were *red* men and women.

But, if it is necessary to add any other circumstance, corroborative of the above conclusion, we may mention that the *Arabs*, or Ishmaelites, are *red*, or copper colored, as well as the Jews, and are alike the descendants of Abraham, who was of the race of *Shem*, as above shown, one of the sons of Noah.

In the existence of the *Arabs*, we have a *tangible* and an abiding evidence, that the Jews were a people who were copper colored, as the Arabs are brethren of the Jews, and have never mixed their blood with that of other people as much as the Jews have. The reason why they have not, is the peculiar location of their country, it being situated along the eastern coast of the Red Sea in Asia Minor, and is an almost unapproachable desert of sand, in the very heart of Arabia, where, from the remotest ages, they have subsisted in wandering hordes, living, many of their

tribes, wholly by rapine and plunder, amalgamating but little with other nations, who have been deterred from conquering the country by the horrid desert and storms of flying sand, so that they have remained a distinct aboriginal people from the age of Abraham and Ishmael, the son of Abraham, in the very face of all the surrounding countries, the same in every age.

Thus, from the foregoing facts, we believe it is made clear that the complexion of Adam, Eve, and the antediluvians, was neither black nor white, but red only.

Some, however, and persons of high reputation, too, have imagined that Adam was created *black*, and that his descendants have, in many cases and countries, been changed into other hues and complexions by the action of the elements. But had this been the fact, *Adam* would not have been called Adam; some other word or appellation would have been his name, as we shall further show bye and bye.

In relation to *this* subject, should the reader desire to know why we have followed the line or genealogy of *Seth*, the third son of Adam, when the Scriptures speak of two other sons, and Jewish history of at least thirty, and of as many daughters, why, therefore, select this Seth in preference to all the others? The answer is, the descendants of all the other sons were lost in the flood, there remaining, even of *this* lineage, the family of Seth, but one thread, and this was *Noah;* there was, therefore, no other genealogy to trace.

Most people in Christian countries have imbibed

the opinion that Adam, Eve, the antediluvians, the Jews, the old prophets and patriarchs, were all white men, most assuredly; but this is a mistake, as is evident from the foregoing. Adam, therefore, in his primitive condition, before he had fallen, and covered his limbs with clothing, was a glorious personage to look upon—being of a bright ruddy *red*, like an image of gigantic size, formed of native copper, instinct with life and motion. Thus, when he moved in the groves of Paradise, he glowed in the sun's rays like some celestial being, gathering from the down bending limbs of the trees the ripe but newly created fruit. Such was Eve, also, his heaven-made bride, though less in stature and more delicately shaped. From her head, formed so as no Greek could sculpture the Parian marble, there fell a silken shower, the black and glossy tresses of her hair (like the glory of the heads of angels, as written by St. Paul), far below her sylph-like waist, enshrouding all her person as with a robe, in the gleamy tissues of attenuated jet, while through this, as the winds softly whispered and played therewith, was seen the bright and fulgent limbs of the first of woman kind. Every motion of her agile form showed her to be the immediate work of God, while the red flush of health, and immortal vigor, mantled her bosom and whole person, like the deep tints of the early sun, flashing athwart the disc of a cloud, varying every moment as she changed her attitudes, and as the various passions of her sinless soul mingled and flowed through her being.

But Adam was of a mightier cast; all the powers

of his body and mind being more dauntless and masculine, decision and force sat enthroned on his face, beamed in his eye, and was redolent on every limb, well fitted and formed to become the head of the newly made world, and the race of gigantic nations of the antediluvians, whose lives reached for many ages—the vast amount of nearly a thousand years. Such was the first man and woman of the human race, but were somewhat changed by the entrance of sin, which not only affected the *hearts* and *natures* of Adam and Eve and their race, but tinged the beauty of their complexion, changing it from a bright florid red to the dark hue of common copper, and awfully agreed with the still darker passions of their fallen souls, who, in this image, brought forth their progeny *red* in complexion, and *beclouded* in mind.

Thus God ordained, and this was surely right,
That the first man should not be black nor white,
But of a copper hue, a gloomy red,
Half way between the two, our primal head.

SECOND SECTION.

Origin of the Negro Race—Argument to ascertain this—Causes of the great varieties of Human Complexion—Doctrine of Climates, and Local Causes to produce such varieties refuted—Impossibility of Human Parents producing any other complexion than their own without a miracle—Proofs that white, black and red men are found in the hottest regions of the globe, and have been thus in the same lattitudes for thousands of years—No Negroes on the earth till many hundred years after Adam's creation—The precise time of their Origin, when and where—No climate forms, or causes the *origin* of human characters—Birth of the first white man, when and where—No white man on the earth till many hundred years after Adam's creation—Argument to ascertain this—The Hebrew Language that of Adam, as well as of Noah and the Patriarchs—Meaning of the word *Ham*—Of *Japhet* and *Shem*—Reasons why God produced men of different constitutions and colors than had the first man—With many other curious matters.

HAVING thus ascertained, as we believe, the color of the first human beings, the question naturally rises here, how there came into existence *other* persons of our race, with *different* complexions, such as a jet black, and the snowy white, vastly varying from the original red.

It has long since been counted the extreme of folly to suppose that complexions, so *far* removed in likeness, as are *black* and *white*, to have been produced by *climate*, *location*, manner of living, or any such thing, as many have believed.

This opinion, that of the power of mere circumstances to produce the entire characters, both of *com-*

plexions and *formation* of the bodies of the different races of men, is now given up as an error by the philosophy of the age. This acknowledgment stands recorded on the pages of our Encyclopædias and literary works of the time. These declare, after due examination and *argument*, that the coldest regions of the earth have not *materially* changed the color of the skin, formation of the body and limbs, or character of the hair of the heads of the different races of men.

Though the African negro man may have dwelt ever so many ages in the coldest regions of the earth, yet he is a black man still, with his peculiar formation of body, and *more* peculiar hair, which is *generally* a perfect wool, there has been effected no material change by any such causes.

The same is equally true, as it relates to the white man, who, though dwelling in the lowest latitudes of the south, near and on the very equator, for ever so many ages, is not changed in shape, the character of the hair of his head, nor *materially* in his complexion. The children of white parents, born in these burning climes, are the very same as when born in cold countries. There is no difference.

It is true, however, that the skin of such persons, when exposed to the air and the rays of the sun, undergo a change called *tanning*, but *this* circumstance proves nothing in favor of a radical or material and final change from *white* to black; because this tanning is always more or less removed by a change from a hot to a colder climate.

The same fixedness of character attaches to the

red or *copper* nations over the whole earth, as neither frigid, torrid, or temperate climates have any effect on their complexion; they remain forever the same. In the formation of their bodies, the color, length, and straightness of the hair of their heads, there is no material difference, whatever their modes of living may be, or wherever they may have dwelt. The Indians of the cold regions of the north, or of the high cold latitudes of the south beyond the equator, are as dark and tawny as they are in the temperate and hot climates.

It is the same with the Arabs of the Red Sea, on the northern as well as on the southern side, in Africa. Yes; this complexion, the copper color, the original and first hue of the human race, holding a grade between black and white, is as strongly fixed in the blood of that race as is the *black* and white in the blood of the other two races.

In proof of this doctrine, the changeless character of those three radical and first complexions, irrespective of *all* contingencies, we notice that on the eastern coast of Africa, in latitude five degrees north, have been found jet black, copper colored and white inhabitants. This part of Africa is called the *Magadoxa* kingdom. The whites found in those regions, are supposed to be the descendants of the ancient *Romans*, who once had great possessions in Africa, after the fall of Carthage, which took place B. C. about 140 years. The Greeks, also, from earliest time, were settlers more or less in Africa.

This fact, that of white inhabitants being found resident in that negro country, is stated by *John Leo*,

who wrote a history of ancient Africa in the Arabic language.--*Morse Uni. Geo., Vol.* ii, pp. 754 and 781.

PROCOPIUS, a Greek historian, of the sixth century, 1200 years ago, speaks of a race of fair complexioned people with ruddy countenances and *yellow* hair, who dwelt far within the *Lybian* country, which is a region of Africa, south and west of ancient Egypt, who, it is likely, were of Greek and Roman origin also.

The same people were found by *Dr. Thomas Shaw*, the antiquary, who wrote in the 17th century, and says, that they retained their fair complexions and yellow hair, although a lapse of more than a thousand years had transpired from the time of Procopius, and that of Dr. Shaw. The latitude of their country is between 10 and 12 degrees south of the equator.—*Amer. Enc., Vol.* viii, *part* 2, *p.* 668. "In Abyssinia, which is a region of Africa," says the *Universal Traveler*, page 467, "there are found a population of many tribes of various colors, as *black*, *copper color*, and *white*, or nearly so." How is this? why does not the climate make them all black alike, if the black color of the negro is the work of climate alone? But nothing is more false than such an opinion.

That time cannot obliterate the distinctive traces of national or original character stamped on the first races of men, was the opinion of the Rev. Michael Russell, LL. D., author of Views of Ancient and Modern Egypt, Palestine or the Holy Land. He says, in regard to the people of Ethiopia, who are now, and have been for more than 2300 years, a mixed

people, mixed with the Arabs, a copper colored race, and though, by their language, it is impossible to distinguish one from the other, yet by their *physiological* qualities in *features* and *form*, they are easily distinguished from the Arab blood, however intimate the mixture might be, which no length of time can obliterate--the negro blood appearing as palpable as it does when mixed with the whites.

This author, everywhere in his work, respecting the ancient people of Egypt, and the other countries of Africa, carefully distinguishes the negro man, or race, from the other dark races and tribes not having the woolly head, and the other characteristics of that family of man.

As to the other dark races of the earth, not mixed with negro blood, we have but little to do in this work; our whole or chief aim being to illustrate, as well as we can, whatsoever properly belongs to the origin, character and fortunes of the people known as the real negro men.

On this subject, the highly popular lectures on physiology, by Professor Lawrence, maintain that the longest series of ages are found incapable of changing the negro race from their blackness, whatever the climate may be.—See *Lawrence's Lectures*, p. 257, and many other parts of the work.

This being true, of which we cannot doubt, it is shown, and even *demonstrated*, that at some ancient period of time, this color must have had its origin without owing it to the influence of climate, and was so radically fixed by some competent *power*, in the blood and existence of the parent of the negro race,

that no lapse of ages, climate or other circumstances, are found capable of bleaching from the blood and skin of the race; of which power we shall treat in due order.

To prove this doctrine, Professor Lawrence, in the above cited work of his, adduces in opposition to those who endeavor to maintain the effect of climate and circumstances in producing the negro race, instances where the different complexions of the fam ily of man have not been occasioned by such causes. All the north of Africa, he says, is occupied by a race agreeing nearly in character with the *Celts* of *Europe*, who are of the whites, the ancestors of all the present nations of that country, as well as of the Anglo Americans. In the year 420 of the Christian era, there were thousands of the *Vandals*, white men of the ancient German race, who, after overrunning all Italy, went even into *Africa* under the direction of their king, *Gonderic*, where they conquered and totally destroyed the aboriginal race, and erected a kingdom of their own, which endured nearly 400 years, being destroyed at last by the Arabs. Of this race of white men there still are thousands yet remaining in Africa, as well as of the more ancient Greeks and Romans, who, during thousands of years, have not become negroes, except by amalgamation.

He (Lawrence) states also, that the islands of the Indian Ocean, as well as those of the Pacific, are peopled by two distinct races of men. One of these races is of a slender construction, the hair curled and woolly, the stature short, the disposition barbarous and cruel, fleeing with terror from every approach of

civilization. The other race is more like the Indians, being of a fairer skin, more humane and civilized, as well as intellectual.

The blacks, or woolly heads, says Lawrence, of these islands are the real aborigines, while the other race is of a later date, from whose presence the more ancient negro man retires into the interior and mountainous districts. It is the same in the island Madagascar, as there also are found two races. One is of an olive complexion with dark, long hair, but the other, the true negro, as black as night.

On the island of Sumatra, which is situated under a vertical sun, where no part of the year affords any abatement of the heat, except by the winds and rains, are found people of quite fair complexions, as well as the real negro. In this very island, continues Lawrence, the descendants of Europeans, after the lapse of ages, are as fair as those born in the country of their parents; but the negroes brought there from Guinea, in Africa, continue as deeply black as when first carried to the island, as they do everywhere else. But on a subject so plain and self-evident, as is the fact of the changeless character of the negro complexion, it would appear almost superfluous to advance arguments, or to quote ancient or modern authorities in its support, when, at the present time, and everywhere before our eyes, occular demonstration is afforded, that neither the color nor character of that people changes; and from which, we at once infer that the *origin* of this complexion could not have been effected by climate.

In the appearance of the negro *race* on the conti-

nent of America, has there one lineament of countenance, or trait of bodily formation, taken place during the 350 years or more since the *first* settlements, which promises even an approximation of a final change to white? Is the wool of such individuals, as have not amalgamated with the whites and Indians, a whit less woolly than it was when they were first brought to this country?

If it were a true doctrine that climate acts with a force so powerful on the complexions and formations of the human body, as to change the African race to whiteness in the northern countries, is it not to be dreaded by all, except *abolitionists*, that the fair skinned Americans and Europeans (who are now flocking to Africa, where, no doubt, many of them will remain forever) may, in process of time, and the operation of circumstances, be all changed in their posterity, to good and substantial black men and women; for if the climate of the north whitens the blacks, the climate of the south must blacken the whites: *surely* it is a rule that will work both ways if it works at all. But of all this there need be no dread, as all former experience contradicts such a catastrophe.

If, then, the three standing original, radical, and primeval complexions of the human race, RED, BLACK, and WHITE, were *not* produced by climate, nor other natural circumstances, how, then, were they produced? In relation to the *red*, we have already shown the origin of that color, which was given to Adam in his creation; it remains therefore to be shown how the other two, the white, and especially the black, had their beginning.

It was with *this* question that we set out at the commencement of this section, which we proceed to answer as follows:

GOD, who made all things, and endowed all animated nature with the strange and unexplained power of propagation, superintended the formation of two of the sons of NOAH, in the womb of their mother, in an extraordinary and *supernatural* manner, giving to these two children such forms of bodies, constitutions of natures, and complexions of skin, as suited his *will*. Those two sons were JAPHETH and HAM. Japheth He caused to be *born* white, differing from the color of his parents, while He caused Ham to be born *black*, a color still further removed from the red hue of his parents than was white, events and products wholly contrary to nature, in the particular of *animal* generation, as relates to the *human* race. It was, therefore, by the miraculous intervention of the Divine power that the *black* and *white* man have been produced, equally as much as was the creation of the color of the first man, the Creator giving him a complexion, arbitrarily, that pleased the Divine will.

THIS solution of the mystery of the origin of the negro's color, we trust, will be acceptable, as there appears in the wide field of conjecture and investigation, *no other* paths that lead to light but *this*. The mind, therefore, seems hemmed in, and driven to this conclusion by the arm of resistless necessity, referring the cause of the negro's color to the arbitrary will and wisdom of God, rather than to the feebler and ineffectual power of contingencies.

But lest the reader may not be as well satisfied as

the writer is, that in the above described manner, the negro race had their origin, we shall pass to other evidences of the alledged fact. Should we omit to do this, we may be accused of relying too securely upon what may be termed *inferential* testimony, as set forth on the above pages; it is our duty, therefore, now, to labor in search of *direct* evidence to the point, though, in fact, the former to the writer seems fully sufficient.

It will not be forgotten, that we have said above, that *Ham*, one of the sons of Noah, was born black, with all the peculiarities of the true woolly headed negro man, by the direction of the Divine power, and contrary to the common dictation of nature. To *prove* this, we shall commence with an account of a circumstance, which, at first sight, may appear of but small moment, in relation to the point desired to be proved. The circumstance we now allude to, is the *name* which was given to the youngest son of Noah, the father of the negro race, at his birth, and that name was *Ham*.

But, says one, how can a *name*, a mere *name*, assist us in this pursuit? We answer, that the word *Ham*, in the language of Noah, which was the pure and most ancient *Hebrew*, signified any thing that had become *black;* it was the word for black, whatever the *cause* of the color might have been, the same as the word *black*, means *black* in the English tongue.

The language spoken by Noah, is acknowledged on all hands, in all ages, to have been the true *Antediluvian Adamic* or *Hebrew* language.

But if this is supposed to be unlikely, on account of the spreading out of the children of Adam in their posterity, over, no doubt, the *whole earth*, before the flood, and that from *necessity*, the language of Adam and his *immediate* house, must have undergone changes during so many ages, as was contained in 1656 years from the creation till the flood; yet there are no doubts to be entertained, that the language of Adam was continued in the line of SETH, which is termed the *holy seed*, or the life of the Patriarchs down to Noah, and from thence to Jacob, the father of the Jews.

Unless this was the fact, it were difficult to ascertain how the record, or history of the creation, the *manners* of the antediluvians, the *names* and the *ages* of the *Patriarchs*, in the line of *Seth* down to *Noah*, with the deeds and acts of many persons who lived before the deluge, could have been known to Moses, and from him been transmitted to all ages and nations since the *great* flood. That the accounts now alluded to, were *not* delivered to Moses by direct inspiration, is shown by there having been a knowledge of these things in the family of Noah, and of course among the descendants of his house, all along from the time of the flood, descending from Patriarch to Patriarch, down to Abraham, and from thence to MOSES; that writer only embodying anew in a book, from older *written* and traditionary accounts, a history of facts, brought down from beyond the flood by the progeny and lineage of Seth, the third son of Adam, written in the Adamic language.

That information of all these things was possessed

by Noah, and the succeeding Patriarchs of the line of *Shem*, the eldest son of Noah, is evident from Moses's own account, as he everywhere refers to the fact of Noah, his children and the Patriarchs, even down to Abraham, having a knowledge of the true God. It cannot be well overlooked by the careful reader, how well Abraham and Melchisedec understood the will of God, and the history of past ages, as referred to by Moses's own account, in his book of Genesis, consequently, could not have been just then made known to him by the Divine inspiration when he wrote that book.

We hope no one will be offended at this, our opinion, for the whole book of Genesis is full of references, to the knowledge of the ancients, of the line of *Seth*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, Melchisedec, and the other Patriarchs *before* his own time.

In relation to this opinion, that of Moses having derived his history of the creation, and of the progeny of *Seth*, from written records, we shall have occasion, in the course of the work, to make still more clear, as we are able to demonstrate that the fine arts, with literature and science, as well as agriculture and mechanism, were cultivated *before* the flood.

We have said, that the word *Ham*, in the original Hebrew, or Noachian language, was the word for that which was *black;* in proof of this affirmation, see Adam Clark's comment on the meaning of the word *Ham*, *Gen.* x, 1, who there says, that Ham signified that which was *black.*

In further proof of this position, we adduce the

fact that the word *Ham*, in the *Coptic* language, which was spoken by the pure and early, or *first* Egyptians, was the word for *black*. Now, as *Mezarim*, or Mezar, one of the sons of Ham, first of all, after the flood, led a colony to the vale of the *Nile*, in Africa, but a little south of Judea, which river empties into the Mediterranean, near where the city of Alexandria was built by Alexander the Great. It is certain, therefore, that the language of this *Mezar*, and his immediate descendants, *must* have been the *same*, with the language of his father, who was *Ham*, and of his grandfather, *Noah*, who were the people *since* called the *Copts* of Egypt.

That *Mezarim*, first of all, settled the vale of the Nile, is admitted by Greek and Roman, as well as by Jew and Egyptian, in every age. The *earliest* Egyptians, says Josephus, were called *Mezarites*, and the country where they dwelt, *Mezar*, as well as one of their *first* cities was called *Memphis*—names and appellations derived from the name of the first settler, or head of the family, who led a party, clan, or colony, to the slimy flats of the Nile, before any other people after the flood.

Josephus, when speaking of this *Mezarim*, calls him the *first* king of *Memphis*, which, as above supposed, was the first city of ancient Egypt (book viii, p. 19), and, therefore, might well be alluded to as the *first* king of the country.

But how does this fact assist us in finding out the meaning of the word HAM, in the Noachian language? It aids us as follows: the *first* Egyptians were called *Copts*, and have been thus denominated

in every age. Now, if this people, who were *primitive* in Egypt, and but just from the Ark and the *tower* of Babel, used the word *Ham*, to point out that which was black, it proves that the same word was made use of, for the *same* purpose in the family of Noah, among the Chaldeans by *Abraham*, and of necessity was used for the same purpose by *Moses*, when he embodied the ancient history of his ancestry, in the book of Genesis, as that work was written by him in the *Hebrew* language.

To show that the Noachian language, and the language of the first Egyptians, or Copts, was the same in the time of Abraham, we have only to call to mind that, when the Patriarch went to Egypt out of Canaan (to which country he had but lately arrived from Chaldea), whither he went on account of a great famine, there was no difficulty in his oral communications with the people of that country. This, therefore, proves that the language of Egypt, in the time of Abraham, was still the Hebrew language, and was the same which Mezarim, the son of *Ham*, learned of his father and grandfather, *Noah*. The Egyptians, therefore, in the use of the word *Ham*, to denote any thing that was *black*, acknowledge that their great progenitor was called *black* in the house of his own father.

It is well known that the Hebrew, or Adamic language, gave names to things and existences, in compliance with the *appearance* and *nature* of things to be named, as we have before remarked. It was *this* circumstance, or the dictating power of the Hebrew language, which governed, when Adam gave names

to all the animals brought before him at the time of the creation; when, as yet, he had heard no sound of human voice, except his own, to copy after, yet he went on, without embarrassment, naming them according to the sensation produced in his mind when he looked at, and had considered the creature to be named. Under this very influence, which governed in the construction of the Hebrew language, Adam gave a name to the first woman, whom he called *Eve*, because she was to become the mother of all living.

The word *Eve*, in the Hebrew, signifies *life*, *enlivening*, nourisher of life, producing and preserving human life. These qualities and powers of the first woman were intuitively and instantly understood by Adam, when he had looked upon her, who then named her according to her nature, which language, like its author, who was God, had infused into it his own *image*, which was truth—accordingly, when Adam gave the names of all things, the language spoke the truth.

In agreement with *this*, it is well known that *every name*, of every being, thing, or existence, has its *specific* meaning in the Hebrew, and, in this respect, it is different from all other languages of the globe. Let any one reflect a moment on this subject, and see if he can find, especially when examining the names of *men* in the English, whether they have any specific meaning beyond a *mere* name.

On this very account, the power of the Hebrew language, in dictating the names of things or beings, the parents of Ham could not well have named that

child anything else but *Ham*, and keep within the bounds of the dialect of their language.

But, in addition to what is already said respecting the Hebrew word *Ham*, we may remark that it was, in some sense, also prophetic of Ham's character and fortunes in his *own* life, and the fortunes of his *race*, as the word not only signified *black* in its literal sense, but pointed out the very disposition of his mind. The word, doubtless, has more meanings than we are *now* acquainted with—*two* of which, however, beside the first, we find are *heat* or *violence* of temper, exceedingly prone to acts of ferocity and cruelty, involving murder, war, butcheries, and even *cannibalism*, including beastly lusts, and lasciviousness in its *worst* feature, going beyond the force of these passions, as possessed in common by the other races of men. Second, the word signifies deceit, dishonesty, treachery, low-mindedness, and malice.

What a group of horrors are here, couched in the word *Ham*, all agreeing, in a most surprising manner, with the color of Ham's skin, as well as with his real character as a *man*, during his own life, as well as with that of his race, even now.

Thus far, we have shown that the very name of this youngest son of Noah, is an evidence of no small account; that he was born a negro, with all the physical, moral, and constitutional traits, which mark and distinguish that race of men from the other two races.

The birth of those two sons, Japheth and Ham, being thus miraculously produced, there is no doubt but that *Noah*, as a prophet, saw, in the births of

these children, the hand and design of the Creator. He had already been informed, in some supernatural way, and, doubtless, by the appearance or ministration of angels, that in about 100 years from the births of his three sons, the globe was to be destroyed by water, on which account he had already been at work twenty years in carrying forward the erection of the ark, when Shem, Ham and Japheth were born.

As a philosopher and a prophet, Noah foresaw, in the ruin of the earth by water, that its mild, healthy, and pristine climates would undergo a horrid change; and of necessity inhabitants of different characters, constitutions and complexions, would be wanted to people it; on which account he bore patiently, for the sake of the Divine purposes, the misfortune of the strange and monstrous production of his wife, in the birth of Ham, the first negro. For this reason, God produced the two new races.

In reference to the foregoing arguments, which respect the *cause* of Ham's name, we notice that *after* the flood, when children were added to his family, the same circumstance, their *complexion*, seems to have exerted an influence on *their* names also. Cush was one of the sons of Ham, which word also had a reference to that which was black. *Cush*, *Cushan*, *Cushi*, and *Chu-Shan-Rish-A-Thaim*, are all of the same or relative import, and especially the word Cushanrishathaim, signifies Ethiopian blackness, as well as the blackness of iniquity.

On this very account, the ancient country of Ethiopia, situated in Africa, in the region of the head waters of the Nile, which was settled first of all by

the family of *Cush*, was called *Cushan*, as well as Ethiopia, or the country of the blacks.

The meaning of the word *Ethiope*, which is also a Hebrew word, signifies blackness, a name given to the country, on account of the color of its first inhabitants.

Even the word negro, is derived from the Hebrew word *Niger*, and signifies black. *Niger*, is a great river of Africa, and was thus originally named, on account of black men having first settled the countries of that river; and hence arose from earliest time the word *negro*, and applied to the race of Ham, and no other people.

CANAAN was the name of another of the sons of Ham. But this word signified a trader or merchant, and seems to have pointed out the pursuits of his progeny, rather than their color. It was from *this* son that the Phœnicians, Tyrians and Zidonians, with all the tribes of the land of Canaan which was Phœnicia itself, proceeded, who were a trading seafaring and mercantile race.

There was, however, a place in this country of Canaan, or Palestine, a district that was called *Chusi*, inhabited no doubt by a colony or family of the race of Cush.

The word Canaan, therefore, appears to have been prophetically given, to that son of Ham, pointing to the pursuits, rather than any other peculiarity of that branch of Ham's race.

The word *Japheth*, is a Hebrew word, and was given as a name to one of the sons of Noah, which also had its prophetic meaning, and pointed out the for-

tunes of Japheth's race, which was to consist of great enterprise, enlargment and renown in the world; one who was to excel, and even to *rule* over the races of his two brothers; which as we shall show in due order, has been wonderfully fulfilled. But there is another meaning in the word *Japheth*, which is of immense importance to the doctrine set forth in this work, viz., that Japheth was *born* a white man, as well as Ham with a contrary hue, proving to a demonstration, if we may be allowed to use so strong a term, that in the family of Noah the two complexions had their real origin.

This *peculiar* meaning is found in the translation of the word Japheth, by the *Rev. James Creighton*, A. B., a most accomplished Hebraist, in his Dictionary of the Scripture, *proper* names, p. 162. This great linguist states that *one* of the meanings of the word *Japheth* is *fair*, or white, which cannot be said of black, as black is not fair. From this translation we learn that Japheth was a *fair white man*, on whose face and form there was stamped in the eye of his father, the sure sign of great intellectual endowments betokening renown, enlargement and rule among men, wherefore, he could give him no other name, than the important word *Japheth*, or the *fair* and ruddy *white* son, his fortunes remaining to be fulfilled in the course of time, while his father, acted upon by the great beauty of this child, gave him his name and blessed him, as the progenitor of a race who were to fill the world with their glory and their numbers, as is now the fact, before the eyes of all men, for the white man, and the white woman,

are paramount in all the improvements of the earth.

SHEM, was the name of another of the sons of Noah; which word also had its meaning, and was *renown*, praise or greatness, prophetically pointing out the character of *his* race, but doubtless *more* particularly, the renown of the genealogy of the holy seed, or line of the Patriarchs, Prophets, the Jews, and of Jesus Christ, who came of the line of Shem. On these accounts, the renown of the house of *Shem*, has been great in all the earth.

The Jews have, in every age, been a wonderful people, who were produced by miracle as in the birth of *Isaac*, when his parents were too old to have children, and have been preserved by power, equally miraculous, carrying out and maintaining the significations of the word *Shem*, which was the *name* of their great progenitor.

In the opinion, that there was, *somewhere*, in ancient ages, *three* distinct colors of the human family, we are by no means alone or singular. This was the opinion of the very celebrated philosopher, Dr. Mitchell, late of New-York, which opinion he published, with many curious matters to the world.

But Dr. Mitchell has not told us at what *period* of time, these complexions had their commencement, whether in the family of the *first* man, or at some other period—or whether there was created three distinct fathers to the human race, as many men do now believe, and probably was the opinion of Mitchell.

Professor *Lawrence*, whose volume of Lectures on Physiology we have already quoted, is of this

opinion, see p. 257, who wholly disallows the power of climates to cause the color of the aboriginal negro; but, like Dr. Mitchell, fails to inform us how that, or the other complexions, had their beginning. He seems, however, to have felt that as he was giving an opinion on the subject of human complexions, and that if climates could not have been the cause, he was, therefore, in reason, bound to say something respecting the origin of the negro's black skin. The *cause* of this he rather thinks, was some ancient *disease* of the surface of the bodies of a tribe of people, which, by long continuance, became so fixed in their nature, that it formed a permanent and national character, as now seen in all the world, of the negro race.

But from this opinion we dissent, as diseases do not work their own cure, and still retain the very evidence of that disease, which is the *black* of the negro's skin. It is allowed that the negro tribes, of all men, are the most healthy, their limbs strong and agile, their skins smooth, soft and silky—long lived and free from diseases; which facts but poorly accord with the idea of a diseased skin and, of necessity, diseased blood.

But we are fully satisfied, that the two complexions, black and white, as they appertain to the human race, had their origin in the family of Noah, as we have contended on the foregoing pages. SUCH a cause is, to the writer's understanding, far more reasonable than any other problem, that as yet has been imagined; such as the climates, a diseased state of the skin, or a father distinct from the father of the other races, as many have believed.

But as we have much to say in the following section, relative to the same subject, though traversed in the light of *other* evidence, we shall here close the present chapter.

> Thus now from Adam's blood, in Heaven's sight,
> Two other bloods were made, as black and white,
> From whom, as from two springs, two torrents roll
> Of tribes and nations, to the final goal.

THIRD SECTION.

Adaptation of *men* and animals, to the countries and circumstances of their being—Early settlements of the first nations after the Flood—Three races of men, black, red and white, in the family of Noah—Great difference between the formations of the bodies of white men and negroes—Reasons why the skulls of black men are thicker than those of the whites—These differences noticed by ancient Historians—Negroes not as liable to infectious diseases as white men—Interesting notice by Herodotus, respecting the heads of Negro men—Curious formation of their feet—Reasons why—Extraordinary fact respecting the Negro's skin being filled with myriads of little cups of water—The reasons why—With many other curious matters.

ADAPTATION of men or animals as to their location, regarding their physical powers, propensities and appetites, favoring their comforts and well being, is a grand law of God in nature. The polar bear has his dwelling amid mountains of snow and ice, the elephant on the burning plains of the equator, the eagle in the heaven above, and the fishes in the depths of the ocean and other waters of the globe, where each creature, though occupying conditions and locations diametrically opposed in nature, rest and rejoice in their places.

Among men reckoned in classes, as belonging to distinct families or nations, the earth has also been divided by the operation of the Divine hand, and suited to their several natures. To the white race, the descendants of Japhet, the northern regions of

the earth were given. To Shem and his descendants, the red or copper colored race, the *middle* regions or temperate clime, north of the equator, was allotted. But to Ham and his race was given the burning south.

The red race, we perceive, like their complexion, occupied a middle region between the two, the blacks and the whites.

This providence was in exact conformity with their several physical characters and constitutions, as well as a remarkable adaptation to their respective complexions, the blacks in the *south*, the red men in the *middle*, and the whites in the stormy regions of the cold and snowy north.

If there was not a Divine hand in all this, why did it not happen that the white race should go south, and the blacks to the north? or why did not the three races, red, white and black, mingle irrespectively at first in the various climes, which most assuredly was not the case, each division of the three sources of mankind studiously keeping themselves apart in a great measure, and, doubtless, far more so in the first ages?

But how is it shown that the hot countries of the earth are adapted to the comforts of the negro race *more* than to the whites, or rather that the negro race was formed suitable to the countries they were to people? It is shown from their formation. The bones of the negro's head are vastly different from those of the white man's, consisting in the difference there is in their respective thickness; the former being made far stronger, thicker, harder and more *compact* in relation to the *sutures*, or seams of the skull

In the white man's head, the sutures are more loosely united than the negro's, which is nearly as firmly knit together as if there were no sutures at all, or as if the head was but one continued bone.

This being allowed, it yet remains, says one, to show the advantage of a thick skull in a hot country over a thin one. This, as we apprehend, is easily done, as the great thickness of the skull bone is an admirable defense of the brain against the *sun*-stroke. Were it not for *this*, that portion of the negro population, who live almost continually in the open air beneath the fervor of a tropical sun, would soon be totally cut off, as it is well known that the whites cannot endure this kind of exposure without great danger, as many lose their lives this way, although their heads are covered with a hat, a turban, or some such defense. But the negro is *never* affected in this way by the sun; no, not even their children, though they are continually wandering on the wilds and in the deserts, bare-headed and naked.

But, says the querest, do not the skull bones of the *whites* increase in thickness in hot countries, thereby showing that it is the *climate* which does this, and that originally, the heads of all men were alike; and thus proving that the climates give complexions, as well as *formations*, to all the human family? Our answer is, that no such phenomenon as the thickening of the heads of white men, who have lived thousands of years in their posterities, in Africa, has ever been known to happen.

MAN is a distinct creature from animals, or dumb beasts, and is not affected, as they are, by circumstances

and climates; God has not produced his *image*, or *likeness*, after so *mutable* a fashion, as that the *elements* should have power to change it. But, says one, is it the *body*, then, which was made in the likeness of God? Oh no, it was the mind; but as the form of the head, no doubt, gives form to the mind, or, in other words, controls its powers by contraction or expansion, it would follow, that if *climate* can change man's shape and color as it *does* dumb animans, *then*, also, it can change the powers of the human *mind* from its original stamp; and thus the true image of God in man, as given to Adam and his *blood*, would become another creature, and some *other* likeness, which idea is abhorrent to the relation which exists between the Creator and his own image, *in* man.

Can any thing, therefore, be more evident, than that God has given the negro his thick skull for this particular reason?

This curious difference between the heads of the two races, was, even in ancient times, a matter of wonder; for Herodotus, who lived 450 years B. C., and traveled much in the different countries of Asia and Africa, has mentioned it in book 3d, of his travels, p. 12, and says, that when in Egypt, the people showed him a place where a great battle was once fought between the Egyptians and the Persians, and the bones of the slain, on both sides. The following are his words: "By the people inhabiting the place where this battle was fought, a very surprising thing was pointed out to my attention. The bones of those who fell in the engagement, were soon afterward collected

and separated into heaps. It was observed of the Persians, that their heads were so extremely soft, as to yield to the slightest impression, even of a pebble; those of the Egyptians, on the contrary, were so firm, that the blow of a large stone could hardly break them."

Thus we see, that the same circumstance—that of the great thickness of the negro's head—was always, as it is now, a formation suited to their condition.

The peculiar form of the negro's *foot* goes, also, to establish the doctrine of adaptation. This peculiarity consists in the great length and width of that limb, the extraordinary protrusion of the *heel* backward, placing the leg nearly in the middle of the foot in many instances. This circumstance is also favorable to them in passing over deep miry and sandy places, morasses and swampy grounds, which trait, it is said, characterizes much of the wilds of Africa.

This circumstance—the great size of the negro's foot, is noticed by *Pliny*, a Roman Historian.

In the production of the negro's skin, there is a circumstance no less curious and admirable than are the other two peculiarities; and this is the placing, by the Divine hand, in the cutaneous covering of their bodies, myriads of little cups of pellucid water mingled with the capillary vessels. By this means, the sun's rays are thrown off, as they are from the face of the waters of lakes, seas and rivers, or the dew drops of the ground, by which that cool and moist condition of the surface of the negro's body is produced—but this is not so with the white man.

On this account, the prevalence of these water cells,

or particles, in the skin of the African, they are less capable of enduring the cold than a white man, whose skin is not thus formed. In cold countries, the negro trembles and withers in the blast, while the white man rejoices in the tempest and the snow; but in the hot regions, the former stretches forth his limbs, his eyes sparkle, and his whole person becomes alive with activity and force, while the latter is enfeebled, flies to some shade, and faints from the effect of the heat.

The great thickness of the skull of the African seems to be a matter of exultation to the race, as in this way they are furnished with a powerful weapon, both of attack and defense, as one blow of this dreadful bone against the head or body of a white man, or of themselves, is found to be decisive, and sometimes even fatal. Instances are known among this people who, to show their power in this way, have actually driven their heads through a common board fence, when the splinters, closing round the neck, held them fast, where they must have died, had they not been cut out by some friendly hand.

The great thickness and hardness of the heads of this people—the African race—is, in another respect, a singular providence in their favor, as a defense against the blows of angry masters, in a state of servitude—it being almost impossible to break their skulls even with a club.

There is still another particular in which they are favored by the Divine goodness, and this is, not being as subject to some diseases—such as the yellow fever, fever and ague, and bilious complaints—as are white men, and in also being generally longer lived.

From the foregoing, and from the fact that the negro race have, in all ages, flourished most in the hot countries of the earth, as in Africa, and the tropical islands, it is evident, therefore, that they were formed and fitted for their place and condition on the globe. If this be true, then we have made out our position, which is, that God formed and adapted every creature to the country and elements suited to their natures, so as to compete with difficulties, and to enjoy their being; wherefore, from the facts of the case agreeing with this opinion, the negro was created *as he is*, and has not been produced and modeled by circumstances and accidents.

> The earth was made, and hung amid the air,
> A fabric great and huge, yet wondrous fair,
> On which was placed all things, that walk or fly,
> And each *adapted* to its destiny.

FOURTH SECTION.

Proof of the existence of the Negro race too near the time of Noah, and in his neighborhood, to allow of the doctrine of climate to have been the cause of this—Remarks of David in the Book of Psalms, on this subject—In the Book of Chronicles on this subject—In the Book of Genesis on this subject—Names of all the sons of Ham, the first Negro—The countries they settled, after the ruin of the Tower of Nimrod—Respecting the color of the Egyptians; Herodotus's account of this matter, as well as of the color of all Africans in his age—Proofs that they were always black, from the very beginning of their existence—Curious account of the wife of Moses—Proofs of her being a Negress, and of the race of Ham—Statement of the prophet Jeremiah, that Ethiopians were black—If the three sons of Noah were all of the same complexion, then follow certain results, fatal to the veracity of the Scriptures—Hercules—Was Nimrod the grandson of Noah, and the origin of all the fabled Herculeses of all the early nations—Some curious traditions of African authority, respecting their own origin—With many other curious matters.

In the labor of this section of the work, we shall endeavor to show that the negro race was known *as* such from the remotest ages, and very near to the time of Noah. If we make this out, it will operate against the opinion which many entertain, namely, that climate has produced the black man. Although we have shown in the argument of the second section of these pages, from the force of the Hebrew language, in giving the names of Noah's sons, especially *Japheth* and *Ham*, and thus made out the existence of the first black man, yet there may be many

who *will not* be satisfied with this mode of investigation. On this account, we deem it necessary to examine the matter in another light, which is to show that there was such a race, and such a people, as negroes, actually known *as such* too near the time of Noah to admit of the operation of climate to that effect. But if we allow that the climate did actually so operate upon the primitive people, it will amount to a great wonder why it did not operate on all alike in the same place and country; and thus there would have been in the world, during the age nearest to Noah, and in his *own* time about the ark, nothing but a negro population, himself, his wife, Japheth and his son's wives, among the number. King David, in the 105th Psalm, says that Egypt was the land of *Ham*. This was said more than 1000 years B. C. David was not ignorant that Mezarim, the son of Ham, settled Egypt, nor was he ignorant of their color or character, as he knew that Ham was called Ham because he was black, the Hebrew being his vernacular tongue.

In 1st Chron. iv, 40, there is an account of a people, called the people of *Ham*, who were then living in Canaan, at a place called *Gedor*. To this place a warlike company of one of the tribes of the Jews went and cut the people off, because, as the text reads, they found in that place "fat pasture and good, and the land was wide and quiet and peaceable, for they of *Ham* had dwelt there of old." From this *peculiar* phraseology, *for they of Ham having dwelt there of old*, we see at once that the meaning is, they had dwelt there from the beginning, or that they

were the primitive inhabitants, as indeed was the fact—Canaan, their father, having first of all, after the flood, settled Canaan.

As far back in time as the Patriarch Abraham, we are able to show that the *Hamites* dwelt in Canaan. See 23d chap. of Gen., where there is a circumstantial account of Abraham buying a burying place, on the occasion of the death of *Sarah*, his wife, from the children of *Heth*. But who were the children of *Heth?* We answer, they were the descendants of Canaan, one of the sons of Ham. To prove this, see 1 Chron. i, 13, where it is said that CANAAN begat *Zidon* his *first* born, and *Heth*. It was of this man's children that Abraham bought the burying place.

This was 1872 years B. C., and but four hundred and seventy-six years after the flood. HETH, therefore, was the great grandson of Noah, being the son of Canaan, who was the son of Ham, and Ham was the son of Noah, making this *Heth* Noah's great grandson.

But there were other tribes and families, the offspring of Canaan, who dwelt in that country in the time of Abraham, as the Jebusite, Amorite, Girgahite, Hivite, the Arkite, and the Levite, as the Zidonians, Tyrians, and many others of the race of Ham. This is the reason why it is said, as we have quoted above, from 1 Chron. iv, 40, that they of *Ham* dwelt in that country of *old*, that is, in the days or time of Abraham, and, of necessity, from a more ancient date, as Abraham found this people inhabiting the country at the time he came there first of all from *Ur*, of Chaldea, beyond the river Euphrates in the east, which,

of necessity, makes them, after the flood, the first or the primitive race of Canaan. But if the people of that age, so near the time of the flood, were all of the same complexion, as abolitionists suppose, the climate not yet having had time to make the great changes since made, how was it, or by what means did they know in those ages, that they of *Ham* had dwelt there of *old*? Surely this would have been impossible, unless they were in some way strongly marked and distinguished from the other two races of Noah, so that they were readily known wherever they were seen, and that distinction must have been their black complexion, as we are not authorized to suppose any other, nor this either.

The names of the four sons of *Ham*, according to the first book of Chron., chap. i, and the Jewish Antiquities by Josephus, chap. vi, p. 21, were PHUT, MEZARIM, CUSH, and CANAAN, four in number. Canaan, it appears from these authorities, settled in the *southern* parts of Asia, along the Persian gulf, and the eastern parts of the northern side of the Mediterranean, as well as all the back country, or mountainous regions of old Phœnicia, afterward called Palestine, comprehending the country of Jerusalem, and quite down to the isthmus of Suez, a strip of country situate between the ends of the *Red Sea* and the Mediterranean, which divides Asia Minor from Africa. This was a mighty region of country, over which the descendants of Canaan spread themselves, more or less, immediately after the dispersion from the great tower.

There can be no doubt, however, but there may

have been among them many individuals of the other houses of the Hamethian race, as there was no great reason why there might not have been such instances, seeing they were all one people; but yet the bulk of the first settlers of those regions, were of the family of Canaan.

Cush and his father, *Ham*, with the mighty *Nimrod*, after the confusion of their language, at the tower of Babel, traveled, doubtless by water, down the Euphrates to the Persian Gulf, as it is now called, the first name being unknown; and from thence by water coasted along the Arabian sea, which is a branch or bay of the Indian ocean, and onward till they came to the strait of *Babelmandel*, a narrow place of water where the Red Sea unites with the ocean, the southern side of which strait is Africa, and is near the region of the head of the Nile, where *Cush* and his fellows settled and laid the foundation of the Ethiopian empire, which continued in some sense to be known on the page of history, even to the time of Christ, when all traces of them, as a people, in the form of a kingdom or government, was lost.

Phut, or *Put*, as it is spelled in the Scriptures, went also to Africa. But as his region of colonization was even west of Egypt, in the interior of Africa, they must have gone the whole distance by land, across the isthmus of Suez, and laid the foundation of the Lybian empire.

Mezarim, it seems, took the same course with his clan or family, passing over the isthmus, and settled on the slimy flats of the Nile, where that river unites

with the Mediterranean, following up the river on both sides, filling, in the process of a few years, the vast vale of that mighty river, for hundreds of miles, with their multitudes, commencing in this way the famous Egyptian empire.

Thus the sons of Ham settled themselves, after their famous attempt to build the tower, which they intended, under the administration of the ferocious Nimrod, as the nucleus of a kingdom of idolatry, and for another purpose, of which we shall speak in the proper place. But how long it was before these brothers, with their respective tribes, clans, or houses, found the countries we have spoken of, and settled there, and how much they suffered from fatigue, hunger, wild beasts, and the various incidents of such an enterprise and journeyings, through untrodden wilds, and unnavigated waters, after they left the plains of the Euphrates and the tower, who can tell? But that they did settle these countries, and were the first of mankind to do so, after the flood, is true and authentic.

Next, and in order to ascertain whether these people were *black*, we shall follow Mezarim, who settled Egypt along the Nile, and Canaan, who settled old Phœnicia, or the Holy Land, since so called. Should we be successful in establishing the fact, from circumstances in history, and the Holy Scriptures, that they were negroes or black men, then we shall certainly make good our first position, namely, that *Ham* was created a negro man, and that all his posterity are, and have been, from necessity, of the same character, as we have heard of no miracle, which

they related to their father the whole affair, in such terms of rapture, that induced the kind hearted priest immediately to send out runners in the direction of the well, although it was then verging toward the twilight of the evening, in search of the man. In this hospitable undertaking they soon succeeded, bringing in Moses to the tents of Jethro, the shepherd priest.

Here the young women renewed their admiration of their hero, while their kind father made him welcome to his dwelling for the night. But such were the elegance and manners of Moses, and his wisdom of conversation, that the good hearted host soon invited the stranger to make his house his home as long as it might please him.

Moses, finding the place afforded him all the security he desired to screen him from the pursuit of his enemies, entered into a contract with this priest of Midian, and became a shepherd, instead of the heir apparent to the throne of Egypt, by virtue of being patronized by the daughter of Pharaoh from his birth.

It does not appear that Jethro had any sons, all his children being daughters, from among whom Moses, in a short time, took a wife, dwelling there with his father-in-law many years.

Concerning this *Jethro* or *Reuel*, as Josephus calls him, the Midianite, to whose family Moses became allied in marriage, *Abul Fara-jus*, an Arabian writer, quoted by Adam Clark, in his commentary on the character of this very man, in the book of Exodus, says that the girl *Saphury*, or as it is written in the

Scripture, *Zipporah*, was the *black* daughter of *Reuel*, or Jethro, which is all one, as he had several names. If she was a *black* woman, then were her sisters also black, as well as her father and mother, who were real negroes, the descendants of Ham, or Abul Farajus would not have said that she was a black woman. But if this is not satisfactory, we are able to prove she was a black person by a higher authority, and will, if we do so, powerfully corroborate the statement and veracity of Fara-jus, the Arabian historian, whom Clark has honored by a reference to his work. On this subject, see the book of Numbers, chapter xii, 1, where the circumstance of Moses having married the daughther of Jethro is spoken of as follows: "*And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman, whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman.*"

Now, as the word *Ethiopian*, or *Ethiop*, is a Hebrew word, signifying that which is *black*, as well as the word Ham, we learn at once that Miriam and Aaron, the brother and sister of Moses, found fault with him for marrying a *black* woman, one of the *cursed* race; or, as Dr. Clark has written it, on this very subject, in the Hebrew, "*ha isha ha cu'shith*," or *that* woman, the *Cushite*, who, it appears, was recognized by Aaron and Miriam as a descendant of the family of *Cush*, one of the sons of *Ham*, the first negro of the human race.

Moses was well acquainted with the country to which the family of Cush removed after the confusion of the tower, and speaks of it in Gen. ii, 13: "And the name of the third river is Gihon, the same

is it that encompasseth the whole land of *Ethiopia.*" Now, why did Moses call that country *Ethiopia*, through which the river *Gihon* flowed? It was because a *black* race of inhabitants first of all peopled it; for the word *Ethiopia*, in the Hebrew of Moses, as well as the words *Ham*, *Cush*, &c., signified black, the country having no name prior to its settlement by the family of Cush, the son of Ham, and, of consequence, the name which distinguished the first settlers would become the name of their country.

But notwithstanding Moses has called the country Ethiopia, yet it was also called in the earliest times *Cushan*, and the people *Chuseans*, after *Cush*, its first king and settler, both of which words signify that which is black. Ethiopia, as a country, is a world of green foliage and flowers, furnishing no grounds for the word Ethiopia to become its name, on which account it remains that its first inhabitants must have occasioned its name by their own peculiar nationality of color.

That an Ethiopian was black, is stated by *Jeremiah* xiii, 23, as follows: "Can the Ethiopian change his *skin*, or the leopard his spots?" which was the same as if he had said, can a *black* man change his skin, or a leopard his spots? as the word Ethiopian was one of the words in the Hebrew for that which was black. From this statement of Jeremiah, as well as from all the other evidences, we learn that the whole race of Ham, the Egyptians, the Lybians, the Ethiopians and the Canaanites, were all so many black nations. The prophet even makes use of this fact, the blackness of the Ethiopian's skin, as an em-

blem of the depravity and wickedness of the Jews, which, he insinuates, they could not *change*, because they had become *so* accustomed to do evil, any more than the Ethiopian could change the blackness of his person.

Thus we have, as we believe, made out that there was in the very outset of time, after the flood, a race of black people, who were made *thus*, not by climate or any other accident or contingency, but by the arbitrary power of God, to suit his own pleasure in carrying out his designs respecting the people of the globe. The genuine Cushite, says Richard Watson, was *woolly* headed.—*Historical Dictionary*, p. 282. This being a fact, proves the races of the other negro brothers to have been of the same character as a people, and yet for a certain reason, of which we shall speak hereafter, from the same people straight-haired black men were produced.

Possibly, by this time, it may be imagined that *so much* labor, bestowed to prove that an Ethiopian is black, is not called for, as all men know they are.

To this we reply, that the question is not whether an Ethiopian is black at the present time, but whether they were anciently so—as there are many who believe that the black nations of the earth have become thus by the force of circumstances, such as climate, food, manner of living, &c. Such persons hold that the people now called Africans were anciently the same as the people of *Shem* and Japheth, whatever their complexions were; but we think we have abundantly shown the entire contrary.

If this were *not* true, it would be *impossible* to un-

derstand a very remarkable prophesy of Noah, and equally impossible to learn *where* to apply that prophesy, and whether it has been, or is yet to be, fulfilled, which relates to the descendants of *Ham*, of which, in its place, we shall give all due attention.

If the three sons of Noah were all of one complexion, and their posterities the same for many ages, or till the climates had time to make some *white*, some *red*, and some *black*, it would be impossible to know the races apart; as some of the descendants of Shem may have been changed into negroes, and some of the race of Ham may have been made into white or red men, and thus, by the operation of the climates, a state of irretrievable confusion been produced, as to the identities of the respective races. From *this* view, it is not difficult to see that the extraordinary prophesies of Noah, respecting the races of his three sons, is of necessity defeated, and rendered impossible to be traced, or investigated in relation to their being fulfilled, and thus the veracity of God thrown back into the mysteries of his acts, which have never been revealed: such is one of the horrible results of the climate argument, in relation to the complexions of the human race.

It is, therefore, highly important to find out *who* the race and descendants of Ham are, so as to know *where* to apply the foreknowledge of God, as expressed by Noah, Genesis ix, 25—27, in relation to *that race*, as well as to the others. On *this* account, we shall pursue the subject a little further, and but a little, lest we may weary the reader with too much of one thing.

That the Egyptians were the aboriginal people of Egypt, is maintained with considerable labor by *Herodotus*, as well as *Josephus*, who say that MENES was their *first* king, and the man who built Memphis, the first and eldest city of Egypt.

He says that when this *Menes*, with his company, came to the vale of the Nile, in Africa, that the whole country was one entire *bog*, except a place where *Thebes* was afterward built, which was higher ground. Of this there can be no doubt, when it is remembered, that every year the Nile overflowed the whole vale of Egypt, which extended in length some hundreds of miles, and was on an average about fifty miles wide. Now, as this immense alluvial was thickly overgrown with trees, grass and herbage, which had been accumulating from the subsiding of the flood, unchecked or removed, there is no reason why it should not have been, as Herodotus says it was, a continued bog, the waters of which had never been drained off by ditches and canals, as it afterward was by the first settlers and their posterity.

Herodotus also says, that the Egyptians maintained that they themselves were the *most* ancient people of the human race, and that from them even the Greeks borrowed their knowledge of the gods.—See that *author's work*, vol. i, book 2, p. 173, 175, 184.

Who was *Menes*, their first king, but *Mezarim*, the son of Ham, who, indeed, according to Josephus, did first of all settle on the Nile, in Africa, there being none before him, which would justify their holding themselves, as in after ages, to be the *first* of mankind in *that country*. Respecting the Egyptians,

Herodotus says, also, that *Hercules* was one of their gods, who was second only to *Pan* (the Creator) himself, in their estimation, and that from the Egyptians the Greeks borrowed a knowledge of this god, p. 204, vol. i.

This Hercules was, no doubt, the famous *Nimrod*, founder of the tower of Babel, whom the Egyptians had *deified*, as Herodotus relates, and that his parents were Egyptians. All this the Grecian traveler learned of the Egyptians, as he knew nothing of the story of the *Hebrew* history, as written by Moses, *that work* having been translated into the Grecian language not till a hundred and fifty years, or so, after the time of Herodotus. This pretense of the Egyptians, about their being the first people of the human race, was but a pretense arising out of a vain desire to be thus esteemed; the very thing to which several others of the ancient nations have aspired, namely, the Greeks, as well as the people of China and the ancient nations of America.

As to Nimrod, the hero of Babel, being the great type of all the Herculeses of the ancient nations, there can be no doubt; for the legends of every country who have claimed him to be a god, represent him as always being armed with a *club* of enormous size, with which he slew the monsters of the earth--dreadful serpents, wild beasts, &c. In this very character the Bible represents him; see Gen. x, 8, 9, where it is written, that he was a mighty hunter, before the Lord, which the Jewish rabbis interpret of his slaying wild beasts, which at that time greatly infested the country of the Euphrates, where he lived.

before he and *Cush*, his father, and Ham, his grandfather, went to Africa and founded Ethiopia.

To find out the true origin of the god Hercules, Herodotus, the Greek, made a voyage from his own country, which was on the eastern side of the Mediterrancan, near to Italy, west of Greece, to the great city of Tyre, which was on the extreme eastern end of the Mediterranean, the capital of old Phœnicia, or old Canaan. The reason why this man took so much pains on this subject, was to see whether his countrymen were right, in their claim of Hercules to be their own natural god, and not derived from some other people.

When he had arrived there, he soon found in the city of Tyre a *temple* dedicated to Hercules. The next thing for him to learn was, how long ago it had been built. He, therefore, inquired of the priests how old the temple was. They replied that it had stood there ever since the building of the city, which was more than two thousand years. This would go back in time, from the period when Herodotus went to Tyre (which was about 450 B. C.), quite up to the era and birth of Nimrod, which was about one hundred and twenty years after the flood.

From this fact, Herodotus was convinced that Hercules was truly a Tyrian, or a negro god, who was also the god of the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, and Lybians, as well as of ancient Babylon, of which empire Nimrod was the founder, although it passed into other hands in process of time.

We have said above that Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, was a negro, and after his death became a

negro god by deification, after the manner of the ancients; for Herodotus expressly says, vol. i, book ii, p. 246, that the *Colchins* and Egyptians, who were all one with the Tyrians, Zidonians, Ethiopians and Lybians, were *black*, and had *short curling hair*. If such men were not negroes of the true stamp, we know not who are, and, also, that they were the children of Ham, or they had no progenitors at all.

Herodotus says that, when he was in Africa, some men of Cyrene told him that they had been as far into the interior as the temple of *Jupiter Ammon*, that they had conversed with *Estarchus*, the king of Ammonia, who told them that the *Lybian* race, dwelling still further within the interior, and west of Ammonia, and far west of Egypt, were all *blacks*. This writer also says, that the whole country *south* of Jupiter Ammon (or the sheep god) was inhabited by *blacks*.

The reader will not forget that all this country of Lybia was settled by PHUT, the son of Ham, and was the remains of the Lybian empire, making it in dubitably certain that the ancestors of the race, as cending up to the first *black* man, through every tribe and nation, were of the same kind of people.

In support of the foregoing, or rather, in support of the doctrine of the three original complexions of the sons of Noah, we give the following, which is a tradition of the ancient *Marabouts*, or negro priests of Africa. This tradition says, after the death of the great king, who came through the waters when the sea overflowed the world, that his *three sons*—one of whom was *white*, the other *red* and the third *black*—

agreed among themselves to divide the property which was left them by their father, in an equal and equitable manner. When they had assorted the goods, the cattle, the gold, silver and precious stones, they sat down to smoke a friendly pipe, saying that next morning each one should take his own and de part where he pleased.

But the *white* brother slept only a short time, when he arose, seized upon *all* that was most valuable and disappeared. A little while after, the red brother awoke, having the same design, but finding that the white brother had gone, and with him all that was most valuable, he seized upon the residue and fled also, leaving behind only a few ragged garments, some pipes, tobacco, millet seed and rice. In the morning, when the sun was pretty well up, the *black* brother, having had his sleep to the full, arose also, and finding all was gone he become sad and sullen, while he sat down to smoke one of the pipes.—*Anquetil's History*, vol. vi, p. 117.

This curious fact, it seems, has somehow spread very far into the world and been handed in a very extraordinary manner down through many ages; for the very Indians of America have a tradition of the same thing, namely, that the Great Spirit created three kinds of men, with three distinct complexions, who were the fathers of all the human race. This tradition was brought to light by the following circumstance.

When the *Floridas* were at first erected into a territory of the United States, one of the earliest deeds of the Governor, William P. Duval, was directed to

negro god by deification, after the manner of the ancients; for Herodotus expressly says, vol. i, book ii, p. 246, that the *Colchins* and Egyptians, who were all one with the Tyrians, Zidonians, Ethiopians and Lybians, were *black*, and had *short curling hair*. If such men were not negroes of the true stamp, we know not who are, and, also, that they were the children of Ham, or they had no progenitors at all.

Herodotus says that, when he was in Africa, some men of Cyrene told him that they had been as far into the interior as the temple of *Jupiter Ammon*, that they had conversed with *Estarchus*, the king of Ammonia, who told them that the *Lybian* race, dwelling still further within the interior, and west of Ammonia, and far west of Egypt, were all *blacks*. This writer also says, that the whole country *south* of Jupiter Ammon (or the sheep god) was inhabited by *blacks*.

The reader will not forget that all this country of Lybia was settled by PHUT, the son of Ham, and was the remains of the Lybian empire, making it in dubitably certain that the ancestors of the race, as cending up to the first *black* man, through every tribe and nation, were of the same kind of people.

In support of the foregoing, or rather, in support of the doctrine of the three original complexions of the sons of Noah, we give the following, which is a tradition of the ancient *Marabouts*, or negro priests of Africa. This tradition says, after the death of the great king, who came through the waters when the sea overflowed the world, that his *three sons*—one of whom was *white*, the other *red* and the third *black*—

You see, therefore, that you were made last, and that is the reason I call you my youngest brother. Now, when the Great Spirit had made the three men, he called them together and showed them three boxes. The first box was filled with books and maps and papers; the second, with *bows* and *arrows*, knives and tomahawks; the third, with spades, axes, hoes and hammers. These, my sons, said he, are the means by which you are to live; choose among them according to your fancy.

The white man, being the favorite, had the first choice. He passed by the box of working tools without notice; but when he came to the weapons of war and hunting, he stopped and looked hard at them. The red man trembled, for he had set his heart upon that box. The white man, however, after looking upon it for a moment, passed on and chose the box of books and papers. The red man's turn came next, and you may be sure he seized with joy upon the bows, and arrows and tomahawks. As to the black man, he had no choice left but to put up with the box of tools.

From this it is clear that the Great Spirit intended the white man should learn to read and write; to understand all about the moon and stars, and to make every thing, even *rum* and *whisky*. That the red man should be a first rate hunter and a mighty warrior, but he was not to learn any thing from books, as the Great Spirit had not given him any; nor was he to make whisky nor rum, lest he should kill himself with drinking. As to the *black* man, as he had nothing but working tools, it was

clear he was to work for the white and red man, which he has ever continued to do.

But still further, in agreement with the opinion of there having been in the outset of time, *after* the flood, three different human complexions among men, we learn that there has been discovered, within a few years, by a traveler, some very curious paintings, in the subterranean chambers of the dead, beneath the ruins of one of the ancient cities of Egypt. These paintings were found executed on the walls of the royal sepulchers, and delineated *three* races of men, distinguished by their complexions, their forms and the signs of their grades in society. As to their complexions, they were *white*, *red* and *black*. The *white* men were placed in such attitudes as denoted them to have been legislators or lawgivers; the *red* men as warriors, with the instruments of war and slaughter in their hands; the *black* men, as servants or slaves, with the tools of husbandry in their grasp. These paintings were so curiously and perfectly executed, that, at the time of their late discovery, they were as bright and vivid as if but newly painted.—*Herne's Historical Researches in Africa*, vol. ii, p. 90.

Thus we have, as we believe, made out that the negro race were known, as they are now known, to have been black, with woolly heads, too near the time of the flood to admit of the operation of the climates to have done so strange a work as to have changed mankind from some other hue to that of black, and therefore shows that they were thus created, as before argued.

We shall, therefore, close this section and pass to other matters, which concern the fortunes of the children of Ham.

What God has done, remains stedfast and true
Nature leaps not its bounds, to products new,
But always is the same, without a change,
In men or trees, through nature's mighty range:
What tho' a *bear* is *white*, in Arctic snows,
And *black*, in warmer climes where blooms the rose—
Yet 'tis a *bear* in *nature*, *shape* and *gait*,
And cannot be a fox, at any rate.

FIFTH SECTION.

The three sons of Noah, all born more than a hundred years before the Flood, aided in building the Ark—Reasons why the Divine Being produced two new races of men different from Adam—Change of the climates of the Globe effected by the Flood—Beauty of the earth before the Flood—Wife of Ham and the wives of the other sons of Noah—Who they were—Respecting straight-haired black men—The cause, Ham, their father, having been woolly headed—Egyptian mummies—One man only between Noah and Adam—Landing of the Ark on a mountain—Noah descends—Plants a vineyard—Drinks new wine—Falls asleep—Ham's conduct on the occasion—Noah's curse of the whole race of Ham—Description of Mount Ararat—The first tents of Noah—Early settlements at the foot of the mountain—*Plate* of the Family of Noah, showing the different complexions of his sons—Arguments and reasons against the amalgamation of the races at first—Arguments that Noah's *curse* of Ham was God's *judicial decree* that slavery was thus entailed upon the Negro race—Character of Ham, from his youth till the curse—Argument that the *curse* was not a mere prophesy, but a decree *judicial*.

THE three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth, who were all born about a hundred years before the flood, came and assisted their father in building the ark, as soon as they were old enough. These three sons were, no doubt, produced, at least two of them, Ham and Japheth, with constitutions differing from each other, as much as they differed in appearance, with a strict reference to the changes the earth was to undergo, by the effects of the universal deluge.

The Divine Being knew that when the flood should

come and destroy the earth, by the violence and operations of the waters, that the climates would be greatly changed from what they had been from the creation. This effect was to be produced by the uncovering of vast regions of the subterraneous seas, which was done when the fountains of the great deep were broken up (see Gen. vii, 11); for in proportion as the water came up the land went down, which would produce, when the waters should retire (on account of more of this element remaining exposed to the air than was the case *before* the flood), an unhealthy varying humidity over the whole earth.

There can be no doubt but the original beauty and arrangement of the countries of the globe have been greatly deranged by the rending currents of the overwhelming waters, the falling in of entire reigions of the original surface, occasioned by the quivering of the earth, as doubtless it was shaken by the Divine Power for that very purpose. By this means the *coverings* of the *great deep* were removed, and went down to the bottom of the seas.

Prior to the flood, it is our belief that the whole surface of the earth was so united by land as not to be separated by water, except mere rivers, small lakes and streams, when both men and animals could and did pass, without interruption, quite around it. Instead of *five* oceans, which now nearly swallow up the whole earth (one-fourth only excepted), there was every where beautiful lakes, great and small rivers, both salt and fresh, with brooks and fountains, so arranged as to beautify and adorn the whole, as well as accommodate every species of animal existence

in the most happy and convenient manner—making it the abode of men and nations, where sickness and death, even after the *fall*, could scarcely enter, except by violence.

One-half of the primitive earth's surface was *water*, and the other *land;* but the two elements were so mingled and arranged as that the exhalations, by the action of the sun's rays, produced a happy and an equal humidity of rains and dews, thus securing an equilibrium of temperature, health, and the growth of all things suitable for food, within the *arctic* and the *antarctic* circles. But when the flood came, it tore by its *currents*, shook and dissolved the beautiful earth, to a mass of entire chaos, as it was when it was first created, and before the water and the earthy matter were separated, by the Divine Power, primevally. Many regions of the *ancient* earth, where dwelt the *first* nations, between Adam and the flood, now lie buried beneath the weltering waves of seas and oceans.

This change of the ancient surface from land to a disproportionate quantum of water, produced, as already said, an entire alteration of the primitive climates, causing a corresponding revolution, in the products of the earth, on which men and animals were to subsist, unfavorable to health and long life; thus aiding in the abridgment of the age of man, from five, six, seven, eight, and even nine hundred years, down to the pitiful amount of "*three score years and ten*," or a little over, as it sometimes happens.

On this very account, the change of the earth's *first* climates from a steady, even temperament; to those of a more changeable character, impregnated

with fiery air in one region, and damp cold fogs in another, the fumes of stagnant morasses and waters, with pestilential winds commingling and pouring their death dealing influences over almost every country; God saw proper, in view of all this, to produce two *new* races of men, who were adapted in their formation, size, color and constitutions, to this *new* state of things which was to take place by means of the flood.

If such was not the reason for the Divine procedure, in producing the two new races, then it is hidden from mortal research, and belongs to the unrevealed history of the councils of Heaven, or, at any rate, it is hidden from the penetration of the writer. From the account in the Book of Genesis, we find that the sons of Noah had taken them wives but a little before the flood, as we learn they had no children till *after* they had made the voyage of that shoreless ocean, and the ark had rested on the mountain *Ararat*, in Armenia of Asia Minor. The wives they married, as to blood and complexion, were the same with all the antediluvians, *red* or *copper colored* women, as there were no others to marry.

JAPHETH being a *blue* eyed white man, and HAM a woolly headed, black eyed black man, their *children*, of necessity, would be of a mixed character in some cases, and in others there would be the likeness sometimes of one parent, and sometimes the likeness of the other. Had the wife of Ham been as black and woolly headed as he was himself, then their race would have been without any marked variation, always woolly headed, both male and female, forever

as *nature*, without the intervention of a *miracle*, does not leap out of her courses in any of God's works.

But as in the race of the white man, there are found black eyed and black headed individuals, with what is called a dark complexion, even in *white* families, we believe that *this* is the result of the blood of Japheth's *wife*, who was copper colored, being mixed with *his*, who was a blue eyed white man. The same is the effect *now*, when the whites mix with the Indians: or the Arabs, Hindoos, or the people of the East Indies, some of the offspring have fair and white complexions, with light blue eyes and auburn hair, as well as often white, and even *red* hair, while others are much darker, with jet colored hair, and eyes of the same description. In process of time, the influence of the *male blood* of the white man will run out entirely the influence of the female blood as to complexion, if no further mixing takes place, there remaining no trace of it, except in the hair and the eyes, which is known to be true.

The same rule operates in the case of the negro *man* when *his* blood is mixed with Indian blood, the power of the *male* overcomes and runs out the female, in relation to her color, causing the offspring to become thoroughly negro, if there is no further mixing as *to* complexion, while the hair and *contour* of the face will continue to be in imitation of the mother in many instances, but in many more it will be like the father; this is also known to be true.

This, in our opinion, was the way the marriage of Ham with the antediluvian girl operated, and thus in the first ages, and as is now the case, there was

produced the woolly headed and the *straight haired* negro, such as were some of the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, the Lybians and the Canaanites, with the Carthagenians, and many of the Africans at the present time, but all pure negroes.

From this fact, there can scarcely be a doubt, that the early nations took advantage of this trait of nature's operations, by mixing the blood of such males and females, as had not the woolly head, together, on account of their being far more comely to look upon, avoiding wholly, or generally, the negroes of the *other* description, which was perfectly natural, and even commendable.

In this way there was produced, and ever has been, two races of black or negro men. The straight haired negro has ever been found to be more intellectual, enterprizing and comely to look upon than the other race, who, from earliest time, have been made slaves of. The woolly heads have always, as a people, been less inclined to improvement, either physically or mentally. By this means, it is seen that the two races had early a mighty barrier placed between them, so that when a woolly head married with a straight haired black person, it was held as great a disgrace for the straight haired one, as it is now, when the whites amalgamate with the blacks.

This race of negroes are found to have heads shaped more after the *Caucasian*, or European model, which was derived from the blood of Ham's antediluvian wife; while the other race of negroes, having from *affinity* of looks, feelings, propensities, and moral abilities, clave to each other in marriage, or sexual

union, they have therefore propagated, and perfected a progeny like themselves, wholly inferior to all the other people of the human race, who were never the authors of any thing great on the earth, no not even as *imitators* of others, except now and then an individual.

With this view, we see how it has happened that when an Egyptian mummy is found, who represents the leading class of those ages in that country, they have almost always straight hair, which circumstance has puzzled physiologists and the antiquary not a little. This fact, however, changes not their character as to their origin, for they are truly the descendants of Ham, as are the other sort of negroes, but simply accounts for acts done by the race, which seem above themselves, if they were nothing more nor better, intellectually, than the woolly heads are at the present day. Neither does it change their condition, in relation to the purposes of the Divine providence respecting them, as they are referred to by direct prophesy, in a very particular manner, as we shall soon be compelled to show.

Thus we have made a few remarks on the subject of the wives of Ham and Japheth, because we have often heard the inquiry made, who did Ham marry for a wife, if he was the first and only black person on the earth when he took him a wife, and brought her through the flood in the ark?

Thus we have passed through, in a brief manner, several interesting topics. But we are now compelled to approach another subject, which, to many minds at the present day, is a stumbling block of no small

magnitude; and this is the *awful curse* of the holy and righteous Noah, the patriarchal prophet of God, the only person who was found to be righteous of all the antediluvian race living in his time; see Gen. vii, 1. Noah was born but one hundred and seventy-eight years after the death of Adam, whose father was the Patriarch LAMECH, born one hundred and eighty-two years before Adam's death, there being but *one* intermediate Patriarch between Noah and Adam; of *necessity*, therefore, how intimate must the mind of Noah have been with all that appertained to the knowledge of God and his providences from the beginning till his own time, and how capable he must have been of instructing his own house in true knowledge, as well as the arts after the flood, as he lived three hundred and fifty years after that event.

It was from the lips of this man that the everlasting God chose to announce the curse or malediction of servitude and slavery upon Ham and his race, as it is written, Gen. ix, 25—*27*.

The *reason* of this terrible malediction of Noah upon his son *Ham* should be carefully sought after, or we may be led to accuse ere we may be aware of it. Such a proceeding as being *captious* and *unjust*, which would be a lamentable circumstance to discover in the character of a man, who is named in Scripture as *one* among five of the holiest of the prophets, namely, *Daniel*, *Job*, *Moses*, *Samuel* and NOAH, see Ezek. xiv, 14, and Jer. xv, 1, and the holiest man upon the earth just prior to the flood.

It appears from the Scripture, that immediately after the subsiding of the waters of the deluge, and

the ark had grounded on a small flat, or space of land, between the fingers of Mount Ararat, which fingers, or points, commence to divide at an altitude of about three miles above the common level of the earth, at the base of the mountain: we say it appears that Noah, as soon as the country had become drained of the waters, descended from the great ship of the flood down the mountain to the more level grounds of the country. On the side he went down, the mountain slopes off from the flat above named (which is about half a mile in width.—*Porter*), in a gradual manner, till lost in the country beyond, while on all the other sides it is a horrible series of ledges, perpendicular cliffs, and benches of everlasting stones and rocks, going up from the base of the mountains to the extreme points of the fingers, above spoken of, to the prodigious height of five and a half miles, where they are covered with unmelted snows of all ages since the flood.

Fifteen cubits and upward did the waters of that deluge rise, even above the extreme points of the fingers of this mountain. See Gen. vii, 19, 20.

How dreadful was this! What a horrible abyss,
Where the winds, and the lightning and thunder,
Went down in the deep! Where ocean waves sleep,
And rent the vast deluge asunder.

Here rested alone old Neptune's salt throne
On the face of the watery star,
Around which, in glee, the fish of the sea
Played joyous in circles afar.

His horses stood near, in their pride, without fear
O'er the deluge's wide waters to roam,
Where at his nod they went forth with the god,
And paw'd with their feet the white foam.

For a particular description of Mount Ararat, and the vast plains which lie at its base, in a semicircular form, extending as far as the eye can reach, as well as an account of the tradition of the natives, who are Mohammedans, respecting the great ship of the mountain, see *Sir Robert Ker Porter's* Travels in that country, ancient Tartary, Persia and Chaldea. This vessel, the great ship of the mountain, or the *ark* of *Noah*, according to Dr. Arbuthnot's computation, was equal in its tonnage to a fleet of eighty-one ships of a thousand tons each, and sixty-two tons over, which was sufficient to carry all the Scriptures state it did, and considerable to spare.

From this lofty mountain range, Noah descended with his family, which, besides himself, consisted of only seven persons, who, as soon as he had found a place that suited him, settled there, and in a short time became a husbandman, or, in other words, a farmer. The place he selected, was doubtless, in the great vale which stretches out southeasterly from the foot of the mountain, where the ark grounded, some twenty miles, presenting to the eye an ocean of green foliage, which had but newly grown, after the receding of the waters, and presented to the voyagers a rapturous sight, who, for a year had been shut up in the ark from the light of the sun, and for another year, no doubt, or even more, had remained on the mountain for the earth to dry, their descent, therefore, down to the green earth, was a joyous journey of some eight or ten miles only.

It was from some cleft of this mountain, which was in latitude 35° north, that the dove found the

had evidently placed between them; amalgamation, therefore, during the three hundred and fifty years of Noah's life after the flood, it is not likely often happened among them.

But from the extreme fruitfulness of these families, there were produced, by the time fifty years had gone by, great multitudes of men, women and children, spreading out in all directions around the patriarch Noah, their common father; who, in cultivating the ground and fighting the wild beasts, which by this time had filled the wilderness, presented a great company of gigantic forest adventurers. These adventurers, in pursuing the game of the wilds, in all directions, for the sake of their flesh for food, and their skins for clothing, would naturally fall in with other tracts of arable lands, streams, lakes, brooks, and rivers; along the banks of which, wonderful discoveries of flowry vales and mountains would be made. Broad savannas, abounding with all kinds of beasts and fowls—the waters with fishes, and the wilderness with berries, fruits, roots and esculent herbs. Nuts of all trees, spices, gums, aromatics and balms, frankincense, myrrh, cinnamon, and odors, wild honey, grapes and flowry regions with perpetual verdure, could but captivate the hearts of these pioneers of the wilds of the Euphrates and Tigris.

The news of such discoveries being continually reported through the settlements, excited the formation of new companies, who, planting other neighborhoods in all directions, soon to the delighted eyes of Noah and his sons, occupied a large district, with multitudes of *white*, *red*, and black inhabitants; who

were pushing forward the respective interests of their clans, or families, with all the zeal of a mighty host of new country adventurers, dressed, both men and women, as well as children, in the shaggy skins of such animals as they could overcome and destroy.

But lest we should wander too far, on account of the exuberance of the subject, we will return to the chief matter in hand, and this is the case of *Ham* and his people. In order to do this, we shall find it necessary to return again to the dwelling of Noah, and his plantation, at the time when, as yet, his sons and their families had not gone from thence, in quest of new places of settlement. In doing this, we will not forget the *vineyard*, which NOAH planted first of all, after the resting of the ark, and his removal out of it, down the mountain Ararat, from which, in its season, he gathered the grapes, and pressing out the juice of the same, drank, and became inebriated, or inclined to *sleep*—as we disallow of his being *wickedly* drunk at all.

That he was thus affected, is not much to be wondered at, as Noah was, at the time of this occurrence, more than six hundred years old, when the weakness of old age must have began to unstring the iron nerves of antediluvian origin, such as characterized all the people before the flood. Now, during the effect of the wine, which doubtless was in its unfermented condition, like the *new* juice of apples, Noah fell asleep, as any old man would have done, after drinking so *invigorating* a draught. This took place in his tent, when, during the sleep, from some involuntary motion of his limbs, his robe, mantle, or

garment, which it appears was but loosely cast about him, became deranged, and fell from his person, while in a recumbent and unconscious condition, there alone in his repose.

Why, or on what account, *Ham* came to intrude on the sacredness of his father's rest, is not known; but so it was. At this juncture, the two other sons of Noah, Japheth and Shem, were not far off; for, when Ham had been within the tent, and had seen the condition of his father, he was noticed by them to rush out in a state of very great excitement, yelling and exploding with laughter. But as soon as the fit had somewhat abated, Shem and Japheth made inquiry, respecting the *cause* of so much mirth and uproar, when they were seized with a fearful consternation of mind, and finding a garment of sufficient size, they extended it between their persons, and went backward into the tent, when they spread it over their father, and retired in silence. See Gen. ix, 23.

The delicate and thoughtful manner in which the two brothers treated their father, on this distressing occasion, is sufficient evidence of their views of the awful conduct of Ham, showing that they considered what he had done was a crime of the deepest dye; a transaction, if perpetrated at the present time, would mark the actor as a character of the basest and lowest kind.

But if the two brothers, Shem and Japheth, were shocked at the behavior of Ham, what were the feelings of his father, when he came to know the fact? From what followed, we learn that the Patriarch was

deeply grieved on account of the reckless impiety of Ham, as well as offended on his own personal behalf; for, on calling this son before him, *Noah* said, by the *spirit* of PROPHESY, words *too* terrible to fall from a parents lips, without a reason entirely resistless. The words which he pronounced, and was moved thereto by the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, contained in them a CURSE, a dreadful CURSE, which not only covered the person and fortunes of Ham, but that of his *whole* posterity also, to the very end of time, for aught that appears to the contrary.

For an account of this appalling anathema, see Genesis ix, 24–27, as follows: "*And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him: and he said, cursed be Canaan (Ham); a servant of* SERVANTS *shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan (Ham) shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan (Ham) shall be his servant.*"

But lest the reader should become perplexed, repecting the *application* of this anathema, on account of the text above referred to being, in the English, "*cursed Canaan,*" instead of "*cursed Ham,*" as it should have been translated; we state that the *Arabic* copy of the book of Genesis, which is a language of equal authority with the *Hebrew*, and *originally* the very same, reads "*cursed Ham,*" the *father* of Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.

In *this* sense it has ever been understood by all

commentators, in every age, on the sacred writings. Bishop Newton thus understood the passage, who also refers the reader to the *Arabic* Bible for the true reading, as does Adam Clark.

Newton maintains, page 19, at considerable length, that the curse of Noah upon *Ham*, had a *general* and an *interminable* application to the whole Hamite race, in placing them under a *peculiar* liability of being enslaved by the races of the two other brothers.

Were not the above opinion the *truth* on that point, it would be a difficult matter to view the Divine procedure in that case otherwise than unjust; for *why* should *Canaan*, who was the youngest son of Ham, be selected from among the four to be cursed, and laid under a *peculiar* liability to be enslaved in his posterity, more than the other three brothers, for the act of their father. But when that Scripture is read and understood, as the Arabic records and understands it, the subject becomes plain, simple, and straight before us. HAM is the man who is denounced with his posterity, who were to become the slaves of the posterities of the two other races, and among *themselves;* for the text says, they should be the "servants *of* servants," as well as the servants of the *hired* servants of the *other* races, as is the fact in all countries, and has *ever* been thus.

It is not our opinion that for this *one act* of Ham that dreadful curse fell upon him and his race. It was not for that *one* act alone, but on account of his *whole character* and *nature* (which one act was, however, in awful keeping with his previous life), that the curse of slavery was entailed on his race.

That the character of Ham's life, up to the time when he committed that unchaste, unfilial, and unholy deed, had been but a continued scene of sin and outrage, is strongly intimated in the words made use of by Noah, when he denounced him, and said "*cursed Ham*," not cursed *be* Ham, as the English translators have rendered it, supplying the word *be*, as if he had not been thus *prior* to that time. The word *be* is not in the original, nor is it needed in the English translation.

The words, *cursed Ham*, therefore, signify, in the Hebrew, that he had been *always* a bad person, even from childhood; for let it not be forgotten that Ham, at the very time he did that act, was more than a hundred years old. All the powers of his mind were as matured *then*, as they ever could be; the deed, therefore, was but a trait of the gigantic negro's general life and character. Had Ham, on discovering the condition of his patriarchal father in his sleep, retired abashed and sorrowful, and had kept the thing to himself, or had related what had taken place with downcast eyes and *real* mortification, it would have been the evidence of the good intentions and pious state of his heart and temperament of mind, as well as, in a degree, would have argued *well* in relation to his former character. The curse, therefore, against Ham and his race was not sent out on the account of that *one* sin only. But as the deed was heinous, and withal was in unison with his *whole* life, character and constitutional make, *prior* to that deed, the curse, which had slumbered long, was let loose upon him and his posterity, as a general thing, placing

them under the ban of slavery, on account of his and their foreseen characters.

Noah did not and could not, as a holy and good man, have pronounced that curse in a vindictive and furious manner upon Ham. No, this he did not do; it was very far from being thus. When the great Patriarch was moved upon by the Holy Ghost to speak as he did on that occasion, we have no doubt but he did it with real pain and sorrow of heart, and yet it *must* be done, as it was dictated by the influence of the *Eternal's mandate.*

Might we be allowed to imagine the state of Noah's feelings on that occasion, and also to give words to those feelings, they would be as follows: "Oh Ham, my son, it is not for this *one deed* alone which you have just committed that I have, by God's command, thus condemned you and your race; but the Lord has shown me that all your descendants will, more or less, be like *you*, their father, on which account it is determined by the Creator that you and your people are to occupy the lowest condition of all the families among mankind, and even be enslaved as brute beasts, going down in the scale of human society, beyond and below the ordinary exigencies of mortal existence, arising out of war, revolutions and conflicts, for you *will* and must be, both in times of peace and war, a despised, a degraded and an oppressed race."

God, therefore, foreseeing the end from the beginning, saw good to direct the mind of Noah, who was a prophet, to declare to the world what should come to pass concerning *all* his sons, as well as Ham, in

the most specific and particular manner. By *this* procedure, God has set up, as it were, *way marks* and data, by which, in after ages, men should come to see, know and *believe* in the veracity of his word, as spoken by his prophets, on account of the *fulfillment* of the same, in every iota thereof, not only in relation to the destinies of Noah's three sons, but in all things else.

On the subject of a child's treating its parents with intended disrespect, see the opinion of God himself, Deut. xxvii, 16, who, in that place says, "CURSED be he that setteth light by his father or his mother, and all the people shall say amen." This sin, the treating a father or mother disrespectfully, was, by the law of Moses, punished with death. See Deut. xxi, 18—21. Consequently, according to this law, Ham was morally worthy of death.

But lest the reader may suspect that this terrible character of Ham is almost if not entirely imaginary, we shall, as promised some pages above, give the history of that deed of his from the pen of Josephus. See Jewish Antiquities, chap. vi, book i, p. 22, as follows: "When after the deluge the earth was settled in its former condition, Noah set about its cultivation; and when he had planted it with vines, and when the fruit was ripe and he had gathered the grapes in the season, and the wine was ready for use, he offered a sacrifice and feasted, and being inebriated fell asleep and lay naked in an unseemly manner. When *Ham*, his youngest son, saw this, he came LAUGHING and showed him to his brothers."

From this evidence, the fact of Ham having treated

his father with great disrespect and wicked levity, is fairly made out, and therefore deserves the character we have described as *his*, and the punishment awarded to him and his race, both *judicial* and as a *result* of his and their *natures*.

But says one, we have always held that this curse of Noah, as it is called, upon the negro race, was a kind of unmeaning rhapsody of the father of Ham, and long ago became obsolete and perfectly nugatory. To unhinge, therefore, a notion so fraught with lightness and falsehood, we exhibit the following, from the pen of inspiration, and having a strong relation in kind and character, so far as relates to the curses of God, or denunciations of the Highest, which he has seen fit to publish in the annals of truth—the Holy Scriptures, we bring them to view as parallels to the case of the denunciation of Ham, believing as fully in their perfect accomplishment as we do in that of the curse of Noah upon Ham and his race.

The first case of the kind which occurs on the sacred page, is found Gen. iii, 14, and reads as follows: "And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art *cursed* above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." This *curse* on the serpent, which was uttered more than sixteen hundred years *before* the curse of Noah upon Ham and his race, has lost nothing of its force and true meaning, though vastly more ancient and prolix in its interpretation, as commonly understood.

A second case, in the character of a *curse*, is found

in the same chapter, as above, at the 17th verse, respecting the *ground*, which, on account of Adam's sin, in hearkening to his wife's counsel, was *cursed*, so that it is supposed to have been far less prolific, from the time of that sin to the flood, and from the flood to this day, than it would otherwise have been had it not been thus cursed by the Supreme Being. The exact form or words of this curse are as follows: "*Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.*" Has *this* curse failed of being continually fulfilled in all ages, though vastly more ancient than the curse of Noah upon his son Ham—and were all equally judicial?

No man discredits the complete accomplishment of the patriarch Jacob's predictions respecting the fortunes of his twelve sons, in their posterities. See Gen. xlix, from the 3d to the 27th verse inclusive, where the wonderful and specific history of that prophet's foresight is related.

Add to the above the terrible curses of God, by the mouth of Moses, upon the whole Hebrew or Jewish tribes, if they forsook the law, which in process of time they did: and how awfully and perfectly those curses were fulfilled, all men know. For a history of those curses or judicial acts of God, see the entire chapter, the 28th of Deuteronomy. Now, with all this before our eyes and impressed upon our belief, are we to undervalue the same kind of inspiration because it is found to affect a subject on which *some* men have made up their minds not to believe, namely, the curse of Noah, or God's judicial act upon Ham,

and his foresight of the slavery of that race, as shown to Noah, and say it was never thus intended?

The appointment of this race of men to servitude and slavery was a *judicial* act of God, or, in other words, was a *divine* judgment. There are *three* evidences of this, which are as follows:

First—The fact of their being created or produced in a lower order of intellectuality than either of the other races (as we shall prove in due order), their forms, natures or passions agreeing therewith, is evidence of the *preordination* of their fate as slaves on the earth, as none but God could have *done* or determined this thing.

Second—The announcement of God by the mouth of Noah, relative to the whole race of Ham, pointing out in so many words, in the clearest and most specific manner, that they were adjudged to slavery, as we have already shown from the book of Genesis, agreeing with the first witness as above, namely, that they were *foreordained* and appointed to the condition they hold among men by the divine Mind, solely on account of the *foreseen* character they would sustain as a race, who, therefore, were *thus judicially* put beneath the supervision of the other races.

Third—The great and everywhere pervading fact of their degraded condition, both *now* and in *all* time, more or less, is the very climax-witness that, in the above conclusion, we are not mistaken—namely, that the negro race, as a people, are judicially given over to a state or *peculiar* liability of being enslaved by the other races.

Why the Supreme Being saw fit to create or to

produce such a race thus low in the scale of human existence, and at the same time foreseeing their character and consequent condition on the earth, is more than can be known by human research, and, of necessity, is therefore none of *our* business. It might as well be inquired, why God made the world at all and peopled it by the two first of our race, seeing he foresaw all they would do in opposition to his will and benevolent designs. *Such* inquiries are probably beyond our depth of investigation, while *facts* are not thus hidden from us, and one of the great facts of God's jurisprudence among men appears to be the *judicial* appointment of the black race to slavery.

Here it is proper for us to state, that many persons, with *all* abolitionists, believe that what Noah said on that occasion was merely *prophetic* and *not* judicial. If prophetic merely, then it would follow that the slavery of the negro race was by Noah foretold, the same as other *wicked* acts of men were foretold by the prophets, but not, therefore, sanctioned by the Holy Spirit. This view of theirs, however, will not bear thus to be softened down, on account of the fearful word "*cursed*," which raises it above the ordinary foresight of the prophets, respecting the wicked acts of men, and makes it a direct *decree*.

It is written in the Scriptures, "*cursed* is every one that hangeth on a tree," Gal. iii, 13, and "*cursed* is every one who loveth not the Lord Jesus Christ." Are not these recorded as judicial, and, on account of the word *cursed*, amount to far more than a mere prophesy?

So, also, as relates to the announcement of Noah,

the word *cursed* being the governing idea, relating to negro slavery, makes it a judicial decree, which involves more than a mere prophesy, placing its fulfillment beyond the fortuitous or contingent acts of men.

The whole three verses of Noah's curse on the race of Ham is delivered in the *imperative* mood, making their accomplishment sure, above and beyond all contingencies. That a day of final judgment is to come, is not more strongly and decidedly set down by the inspired writer than is the doom of the negro race in the particular of servitude, and will not be more certainly fulfilled than has been and is now fulfilling the word of the Lord by Noah.

On the subject of *judicial curses*, see Deuteronomy, the 27th and 28th chapters, in which there are no less than sixteen such decrees or curses, all of which, however, were *conditionally* suspended over the heads of the twelve tribes. If they would obey the law, then *blessings* should be their portion, but if they transgressed in the particulars mentioned in those sixteen verses above alluded to, then they were cursed, and *judicially* so.

Some of those curses are as follows—see the 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th verses of the 28th chapter of Deut.: "But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day, that all these *curses* shall come upon thee, and overtake thee. CURSED shalt thou be in the city, and CURSED shalt thou be in the field. CURSED shall be thy basket and thy store. CURSED shall be the fruit of thy body,

and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine and the flocks of thy sheep. CURSED shalt thou be when thou comest in, and CURSED shalt thou be when thou goest out."

Now, who will deny but the above *curses* were *judicially* pronounced, though conditionally. But in the *curse* of Noah, which was by the authority of the same God, there was no condition at all, it was a direct *curse*, without remedy, palliation, or chance of escape. How is it possible, therefore, for any one to maintain that the curse of Noah on the race of Ham was not a *bona fide* judicial decree, not a mere prophesy, the fulfillment of which should happen contingently; but a *decree* which should be fulfilled, irrespective of contingencies, in an arbitrary and executive manner.

Thus we believe that sufficient evidence appears from the Scriptures, of the *judicial* appointment of that people to servitude. In view of this belief, and of that fact, the inquiry naturally arises here, whether it is a *sin* to enslave a negro. To this we are compelled, even against our sympathies and preconceived opinions arising out of our *education*, to answer *no*, it is *no* sin in *principle;* the *manner* in which it may be done may be sinful, as it is in our power to abuse any and all the privileges put in our hands by the Divine Being.

We are *driven* to the above conclusion by sheer logical violence, and as follows:

If God appointed the race of Ham judicially to slavery, and it were a heinous sin to enslave one, or all the race, how then is the appointment of God to

go into effect? The reader can but see, as well as *feel*, the dilemma. The judicial acts of God do never involve the actual commission of sin any more than his works, or acts of mercy and benevolence—it is the *way* we *use* such acts, as they relate to men, that sin arises, and not out of the acts of God themselves, as the primary and moving principle of sin. If the actor, in his doings in this life, is aware that he is an instrument in the hands of the Divine Providence of fulfilling, or carrying into effect a divine judgment, he is only to be careful *how*, and in what *spirit*, he does the thing, lest he should be found acting as of himself, and independent of God, making the *execution* of the Divine will his *own* vindictive, arbitrary, or thoughtless work: *such* a course *is* sin.

The destruction of the old Canaanites, by the Jews, was a *judicial* act of God, who straightly commanded them, by the ministration of Moses (see Deut. vii, 2), that they should not spare them, nor show mercy or pity toward them; and yet they were not to be wantonly cruel or murderous, as if they were acting entirely from mere fury and love of butchery. That dreadful affair, the exterminating decree of God against the negroes of old Canaan, was not by the will of man, but of God; the instruments, therefore, were not to sin in its execution by deeds of *useless* eruelty and ferocity; if they did, then such acts were sinful.

God does never sanction sin, nor call for the commission of moral evil to forward any of his purposes; wherefore we come to the conclusion, that it is not

sinful to enslave the negro race, providing it is done in a tender, fatherly and thoughtful manner, having the *fear* of God before our eyes, in a transaction of the kind, doing no violence to the bodies or minds of such persons as slaves or servants, beyond proper and *necessary* correction.

This is as easly accomplished as is the government of a family, in the ordinary sense of the word, or the good men of old could not have done it, as they most assuredly did, upon which we shall treat in due order. It is the *abuses* of the institution of negro slavery, which have recently, by the Divine Providence, aroused the sympathies of men, but not the principle itself, as God cannot resist his own determinations.

There is no man except infidels, and those who are tinctured with principles of the infidel character, who for a moment doubts the *judicial decision* of God in relation to *murderers*, as announced to Noah, and all mankind through him. This act of God is found on the page of the Divine record, in the *same* chapter with the act respecting the negro race, name ly, the ixth, at the 5th and 6th verses, as follows: "And surely your blood of your lives will I require * * * at the hand of man: at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood (by murder), by *man* shall his blood be shed: for in the *image* of God made he man!"

This judicial act was announced, not to the ears of the half civilized and barbarous Jews, as *some* men speak, when the law of Moses was given, but to the wise and enlightened house of Noah, about

eight hundred years *before* the law of Moses; it was, therefore, the adjudication of God, at the head of time, to all the nations who might arise on the earth to the end of the world, respecting *murderers*. THIS passage is allowed by all to be *judicial*, but not the other by many, though by the same authority, and equally specifically noted down, and without any condition.

This judicial act of God is responded to in the ten commandments, where it is written, "thou shalt not kill," or, in other words, thou shalt not *murder;* not meaning, as many contend, that a murderer must not be killed—not even by a public execution. So also is the *act* of God, in relation to the judical condemnation of the race of Ham, equally responded to in the ten commandment, or law of Moses, where it is written, "thou shalt not *covet* thy neighbor's *man* servant (or slave), nor his maid servant," or female slave, as it is in the original. If the servants, or slaves, alluded to in that commandment, which is the tenth and last, were not therein recognized as *property*, how could a slave be a subject of *covetousness* as well as an ox, or an ass, creatures no one denies but were property, which are classed together in that command, and referred to in the same light equally, as being property, and as objects that might be coveted as such.

Thus far we have treated on the curse of Noah against Ham, or, in other words, upon the *judicial* act of God, in relation to that people. Our next endeavor will, therefore, be to ascertain whether this judgment was acted upon, recognized or sanctioned

by the next dispensation following that of the Patriarchs, namely, the law of Moses and his successors—the prophets, kings, nobles and elders of the Jewish government—as was all the other judicial acts of God, *prior* to the law.

> Thus Ham, the sooty monarch of his race,
> Adjudg'd of Heaven to fill a servant's place,
> Sits regal on his throne, in frowning ire,
> The king of slaves, their patriarch and sire,
> Whose state of servitude can never cease,
> Till the end of time shall bring the grand release.

SIXTH SECTION.

Proofs from the Scriptures, that the *curse* of Noah upon the race of Ham, as a *judicial* act, is *indorsed* by the law of Moses—Comparative view of all the orders of servants among the Jews, as the *hired* Hebrew servant, the *bought* Hebrew servant, the *voluntary* Hebrew servant, and the Negro or Canaanite slave—Remarks on the subject of the *strangers*, of whom the Jews *might* take usury, and of whom they might *not* take usury—Respecting who the strangers were, who they should not enslave, or use as bondmen—A seeming contradiction in the law on this subject reconciled—Perpetual slaves to be bought of the Negro heathen of old Canaan, as directed by the law—Strictures on Abolitionist opinions, respecting the meaning of the law relative to servants—Character of Noah and Lot rescued from abolitionist aspersions—Strictures on the opinions of abolitionists, respecting the word BUY, as applied to the purchase of *bondmen*, in the law of Moses, with other matters of their setting forth—Difference between the condition of *Hebrew* servants and their Canaanite slaves, with respect to the *jubilees*, and other matters—Proofs that the Hebrews bought and sold Negro slaves under the sanction of the law; even going to Africa for that purpose—Enslaving of the persons of the Amalekites under the eye of Moses—Slaves of the patriarchs bought with money—A curious query of abolitionists answered, with many other matters.

As remarked at the close of the foregoing section, it will be our endeavor in the following to ascertain whether, in the law of Moses, the judicial act of God against the race of Ham, as announced by Noah, was indorsed, and acted upon accordingly, by the Hebrews.

To do *this*, it will not be necessary to prove, in this

section, that the inhabitants of Canaan, whom the Jews were to destroy, were of the genealogy of Ham, including the whole seven nations of that country, and were the direct descendants of this man through CANAAN, a son of his, as all this has been done in the fourth section of the work, and elsewhere.

On this account, our labor is therefore straight before us, namely, to ascertain whether, in the law of Moses, the curse of Noah against Ham and his people, is actually recognized, indorsed, and acted upon as judicial, in relation to their enslavement, in the strict and literal sense of the word.

In a certain chapter of the book of Leviticus, namely, the xxvth, are found sundry directions embodied in the law of Sinai, respecting servants of various kinds. Here it is found written, that any Hebrew having *bought*, not *hired*, a Hebrew servant, should *not* be oppressed, or ruled over with rigor, as they would rule over or oppress a BONDMAN, *not* derived from the Hebrew stock.

From the 35th to the 46th verse inclusive, of the above named chapter, it is written as follows, except the words included in brackets, which are inserted to carry out, and to distinguish the true meaning, and to prevent confusion:

"And if thy BROTHER [*a Hebrew, one of the twelve tribes*] be waxen poor, and fall into decay with thee [*or in thy midst*], then thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a stranger [*far from his own tribe*], or a sojourner [*one who had come from another tribe*], that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury of *him*, or increase, but fear thy God [*in this thing*],

that thy *brother* [*a Hebrew, or of the Hebrew blood, not a negro*] may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him [*that is, a Hebrew brother, one of the tribes*] thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase. And if thy *brother* [*not a Hamite*], that dwelleth by thee, be waxen poor, and he be *sold* unto thee [*on any account*], thou shalt not *compel* him to serve as a bond servant: but as a *hired* servant, and as a [*Hebrew brother, one of the tribes*] sojourner, he shall be with thee, and serve thee unto the year of jubilee; and *then* shall he depart from thee [*that is, if he desire to do so*], both he and his children [*if he has any*] with him, and shall return unto his own family [*or tribe*], and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return; for they are my servants, which I brought out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be *sold* as BONDMEN. Thou shalt *not* rule over him [*or such an one*] with rigor [*as you may over a bond slave*], but shalt fear thy God [*in this particular*]."

From the above, it is clear that by the term BROTHER, *no other* character is specified as being entitled to the above named privileges, as paupers, of whom no usury was to be taken for money or victuals, but a regular Hebrew, or one of the twelve tribes. This is made clear by the *qualifying* words of the account, which says, "*for they are my servants, which I brought out of the land of Egypt.*" Now God brought no Canaanites or negroes out of Egypt, they were wholly of the twelve tribes of the Hebrews.

Thus we see that Moses marked out in the law the

difference there was between *bond* servants, *hired* servants, and servants of the *Hebrew tribes*, who might be *sold*, on account of their poverty.

But in the law there are *other* strangers alluded to, who were neither of any of the twelve tribes, nor of the Canaanite race, of whom the Hebrews *might* take usury of money or victuals (Deut. xxiii, 20), but could not *legally* make *bond* men of them.

These were the race of Shem, and not of the twelve tribe community, who were dwelling in the surrounding countries. Of such there were many in the time of Moses, as well as during the whole existence of the Jewish people, as a kingdom or government, who, in the law, are never called *heathen*, as were all the negro race.

There were the descendants of Lot, Abraham's half brother. There were the children of *Katura*, born to Abraham long before the birth of Isaac, who, when they were grown up and married, were sent eastward with their inheritances. See Gen. xxv, from the 1st to the 6th verse inclusive. By this first marriage, Abraham had no less than *six sons*, who, according to the history of them given in the above trait in the Book of Genesis, were the fathers of multitudes, all of whom settled eastward of Chalden, and took place *before* God commanded Abraham to leave his father's house in *Haran* in old *Chaldea*, east of the river Euphrates, in order to go to the country of Canaan, far to the south-west. We come to this conclusion, respecting Abraham, from the *necessity* of the case, for Abraham was, at the death of Sarah, one hundred and thirty-seven years old, as he was ten years older than his wife, who died at the age of one

hundred and twenty-seven. Gen. xxiii, 1. Of necessity, therefore Abraham's wife *Katura* was his first wife, who he had married in his youth, and was dead when he took Sarah, and came to Canaan, on which account his great age, that of one hundred and thirty-seven years, he could *not* have been the father of the above named six sons *after* the death of Sarah, as the order of the history in Genesis xxv seems to intimate, which is a mistake of the Hebrew copyists, and compilers of the ancient Scriptures.

Then there was Ishmael, the son of Hagar, the Egyptian *bond servant* of Sarah, born to Abraham, of whom came many nations now known, as in ancient times, as Arabs or Ishmaelites. These were also the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob, who were known as the *Idumeans*. There were the descendants of *Laban*, the Syrian, a near relation of Abraham, all of whom, together with those above named, amounted to millions in the time of the giving of the law, and during the nationality of the Jews, who were the strangers alluded to, of whom the Hebrews *might* take *usury*, or interest, for lent *victuals* or lent *money*, as it is specifically stated in Deut. xxiii, 20, but not of their *brethren*, which appellation brother *always* meant a member of the great confederacy of the *twelve* tribes, and nobody else. That this was the case respecting the term *strangers*, we have the favoring opinion of Adam Clarke, in his remarks on the 2 Chron. xv, 9. The text reads as follows: "And he (Asa) gathered all Judah and Benjamin, and the *strangers* with them out of *Ephraim*, *Manassah* and *Simeon*."

From this it is clear that members of the twelve tribes were called *strangers*, if dwelling at a distance from Judea, or the capital, who were not to be charged with usury on any account, while other strangers should be. Of their *brethren*, therefore, they could *not* take usury, but of *all* strangers they might, whether black, white or red.

But of no *stranger* did the law of Moses allow *bond* men or *bond* maids to be made, except of the negro or Hamite race, for to that people alone did the curse of *servitude* refer, which fact was as well known to Moses as to God, and all the Hebrew tribes, as well as to the people of Ham themselves, with all other nations.

That the law of Moses did not allow of any *stranger* being oppressed in the matter of slavery, who were not of the race of Ham, is shown, Exodus xxii, 21, where it is written, "thou shalt neither *vex* a stranger nor oppress him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." And yet for the very purpose of oppressing and vexing the negro Canaanites, the Jews were sent into the land of Canaan, by which it is most evident, that the term *stranger* in the *law* did not apply to that people, the Canaanites, in the palliative or merciful sense.

But how is this? says one; the text just now quoted out of Exodus xxii, 21, straightly says, that no stranger should be oppressed nor vexed, and yet, from Levit. xxv, 45, it appears that *strangers* might be sold and bought for slaves or *bondmen;* is not this a plain contradiction, one text forbidding the oppression of a stranger? and another allowing it, and both pas-

sages written in the same law, and apparently about the same thing.

The following is the solution, or, as it appears to the mind of the writer, there is no solution at all to these *seemingly* contradictory scriptures.

When Moses in the law, and at the 25th division or chapter of the part called *Leviticus*, had made an end of his remarks and directions about various kinds of servants, with other matters, introduced a *new* subject (see verse 44), namely, that of unqualified *slavery*, or of *bond servants*, which he commences as follows: "*Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy, bondmen and bondmaids.*"

In this passage it is clear, that the law of Moses *peremptorily* directed, that *all* their perpetual slaves, or *bond* servants, should be procured from among the *heathen negro* race, the very people to whom the *curse* of Noah referred, and are *always* referred to as *heathens*, whether Canaanites, Egyptians, Lybians or Ethiopians, all of whom are referred to as HEATHEN, in the most emphatic sense of the word, in the law.

The terms *gentile* and *heathen*, as used in the Scriptures, *seems* always to be of synonymous import; but in the law of Moses it would appear that the word *heathen* designated solely the people of Canaan, and the other branches of the negro race. The term gentile is not found in any of the books of the law of Moses, properly so called; for the book of Genesis is not to be numbered as any part of the *law* or *code* of that legislator. The *law* does not properly com-

mence until the book of Exodus, and runs through the remaining *four*, commonly called the books of Moses.

On account of the absence of the word or *term gentile*, in the books of the law, *properly* so called (for the book of Genesis is but a narrative or history of the first ages of the earth, and no part of the *law*), we conclude that the word *heathen*, as used in the law by Moses, referred solely to the Canaanites, and to their race, the blacks or negroes in general. We are the more confirmed in this opinion, because Moses himself calls the people of JAPHETH, who were white men, GENTILES. See Genesis x, 5.

In that chapter, namely, the 10th, Moses has given an account of three races of men, the sons of Noah, and what they were called as *nations*. In this account, which is the *eldest* of all history, at the 5th verse of the chapter above named, the descendants of *Japheth* are called gentiles, in distinction from the other two races, those of *Shem* and *Ham*.

In after ages, however, the terms *gentile* and *heathen* seem to have become synonymous, as referring to all the people of the globe, except the Jews. But in the *law* the word *gentile* does not occur. The word *heathen*, therefore, as used by Moses, referred exclusively *at that time* to the negro race, and to *no other people:* this opinion cannot be refuted.

The term *heathen* therefore as used in the *law*, referred entirely to the race of Ham, who had been judicially condemned to a condition of servitude, more than eight hundred years before the giving of the law, by the mouth of Noah, the medium of the Holy Ghost.

The law was given from *Mount Sinai*, which was

southward from Canaan. Now Moses said in the law, that when they (the Jews), should come into *that country*, that of the *heathen* round about them, they should make *bondmen*, or slaves of the people in those regions; and as there were no other people inhabiting old Canaan but the negroes of the race of Ham, it is certain that by the term *heathen*, no other people were alluded to.

In the time of St. Paul, the term *gentile* (as in the days of Noah, see Gen. x, 5) referred to the nations of the white race; as it is written by that apostle, in several of his letters to the churches, that he was the apostle of the *gentiles*. Can it be shown that Paul ever preached to a negro people at all? If not, then it follows that the word *gentile*, still referred to white men, in his time, as to Greeks, Romans, Gauls, Italians, Spaniards, and other nations of the north, but never to the negro race.

The *strangers*, therefore, to whom Moses alluded in Levit. xxv, 45, were the people of *Ham*, in all countries, whether Canaan, Egypt, Ethiopia, Lybia, or any other country or place inhabited by negroes.

This distinction is made still more clear by St. Luke xxi, 24, where the *power* which was finally to destroy Jerusalem, is called "*the gentiles*," who, it is well known, were the Romans, an empire of white men. This is further proven from the statement of that apostle, in Acts xxviii, 28, who, while at Rome, was a prisoner. In that passage it is said that as the Jews rejected the gospel, that he should turn to the *gentiles*, and that they would receive it. Paul was then in the very heart of the Roman or gentile states,

and, therefore, of necessity, proves that the term signified no *other* race, but that of the whites.

This verse, therefore, the 45th, of the 25th of Leviticus, *must* be considered as the *context* or *guide*, in relation to the word stranger on this subject; consequently, in verse the 46th, the one which follows the text above quoted, is *qualified* by the *first*. It so, then the word *stranger*, there used, refers not to any of the Shemite or Japhethic races, but only to the *heathen* race of *Ham*.

With *this* view, all is made right, the *stranger* of Exodus xxii, 21, signifying all people not of the negro race; while the stranger of Leviticus xxv, 45, refers to all negroes, or people of Ham, though not strictly Canaanites, as, doubtless, there were among the Canaanites always, more or less, people, families, and even whole tribes, of the other families of Ham's lineage, such as Egyptians, Lybians and Ethiopians, who might properly be denominated *strangers* in Canaan, or *heathens* of those descents from other countries than those of Canaan. Thus we have reconciled the two contradicting passages, as we believe, in the estimation of all candid men.

Having thus cleared up a difficulty in the law of Moses, which has misled many a fierce abolition writer, and probably others, we pass to the main subject, that of ascertaining whether the law of Moses did indorse and inculcate the *doctrine* of the curse of Noah upon the children of Ham, which we affirm was the fact. The proof of this is direct and unequivocal, furnished from the law of that great legislator of the Jews, Moses, who was the immediate agent

of Jehovah himself to that people. See Levit. xxv, from the 44th to the 46th verse inclusive, which reads as follows:

"Both thy *bond* men and thy bond maids which thou shalt have, shall be of the *heathen* that are round about; of them shall ye *buy* [not *hire*] bond men and bond maids. Moreover, of the *children* of the *strangers* [that is, the children of negroes, foreign to Canaan, who might be dwelling among the Canaanites], that do [or may] sojourn with you, of *them* shall ye buy [children], and of their families that are with you, which they beget [or might beget] in your land [Canaan, after the Jews should possess it], and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an *inheritance* for your children after you, to inherit them as a possession: *they* shall be your bond men *forever!*"

Was this buying the *children* of the heathen Canaanites, and using them as *bond men* and *bond maids*, or, in other words, as slaves, nothing, after all, but a privilege granted by Moses to the Hebrews of *hiring* them—as is pretended by abolitionists, in order to get rid of the force of those passages of the law in support of the enslaving the negro race?

But men as wise as any of these, even CLARKE and BENSON, in their renowned commentaries of the Scriptures, have not gainsaid their meaning in this particular: these champions of knowledge, though English abolitionist, pass entirely over those extraordinary passages without one solitary remark. This strange omission is, in our opinion, as much as if they had said that the fact of the *indorsement* of the law

of Moses upon the curse of Noah, in relation to the people of Ham, is here incontrovertibly made out, on which account, they were not bold enough, though abolitionists, to contradict that decision of heaven.

How is it that Adam Clarke, who was the most learned man in Christendom, and a man who has criticised, wisely and profoundly, on almost every verse of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly on those involving the most difficult subjects, should have thus passed silently over this remarkable trait in the book of the law? Had he considered that portion of the holy text above his comprehension, or beyond the reach of human understanding, and as containing matter too obscure for the lights of science and criticism to penetrate, he would have said as much; but this he has not done.

Other commentators, however, have not thus withheld their opinions on these passages, although the doctrine contained in them is exceedingly repulsive to the minds of many. Among such as have ventured an opinion is *Dr. John Gill*, a Baptist commentator on the Holy Scriptures, of great learning, who wrote *before* the times of abolitionism. This divine has boldly asserted, as every unprejudiced reader would do, that the Hebrews, in those *three* famous verses of the law, were allowed to have real *bond men*, or slaves. The following are his words on the 46th verse of the 25th chapter of Leviticus, which reads: "And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you." Such servants "they might leave at their death to be inherited, as they did their estates and lands; for such servants are

(says *Gill*) esteemed by the Jews to be like immoveable property, as fields, vineyards, &c., to inherit them for a possession as their property, like any thing else that was bequeathed to them, as negroes now are in our plantations abroad: they were to be their bond men for ever, and not to be released at the year of Jubilee."

The above is a true comment; for in every age the Jews, as well as the more ancient Hebrews, their ancestors, have reckoned their *bond* slaves as property; and thus every commentator, in every age and language, upon the Holy Scriptures, have determined, except of late, as in the persons of all abolitionists.

Respecting the opinions and speculations of some of these men, who are the leaders of the party, and agitators of the subject of negro emancipation in America, we give the following as their views of the meaning of the law of Moses, as it regards *bond slaves*.

See a series of pamphlets, entitled "The Bible against Slavery," 1838. This writer dashes boldly into the matter, and at once settles the subject for ever. Of this work, see a note, page 9, 4th edition, which reads as follows: "The Bible *record* of *actions* is no *comment* on their moral character. It vouches for them as mere *facts*, not as *virtues*. It records without rebuke, Noah's drunkenness, Lot's incest, and the lies of Jacob and his mother, not only single acts, but *usages*, such as polygamy and concubinage; all these are entered on the divine record *without* censure. Is that *silent* entry God's indorsement? Because the Bible, in its catalogue of human actions,

does not stamp on every crime its *name* and *number*, and write—*this* is a crime, does that wash out its guilt and bleach it into a virtue?"

The writer of the note above alluded to is combating the belief which has always been entertained from the reading of the passages in the 25th of Leviticus, as above quoted, that the Hebrews *might*, if they *would*, enslave the people of old Canaan, and endeavors to give them *another* meaning. He informs the reader, in that note, that the statements of Moses, on the subject of slavery, as they related to the race of *Ham*, were nothing but a record of *crimes*, written against his countrymen for thus enslaving the Canaanites—and this is the opinion of all abolitionists.

He allows, it is true, that Moses did not *blame* the Hebrews for enslaving the Canaanites and the strangers of the Hamite race dwelling among them, but that he made an *entry* in the book of the law of that dreadful sin; but that entry was *not* an approval—it was a record only of the crime.

The above is a most singular opinion, and has as much of the *dust* of sophistry in its composition as any written remarks we have ever met with. To perceive this, we have only to recollect that *when* that permissive trait of the law of Moses was given, was more than forty years *before* the Jews got possession of the country of Canaan; how, therefore, could the remarks of Moses, which are found in Lev. xxv, 44—46, be a record of the *crime* of slavery, when the thing alluded to, prospectively, had not as yet been done by forty years or more. After the giving of the law from Mount Sinai, it was more than

forty years before the Hebrews, under the conduct of Joshua, went through the river Jordan into the promised land.

Those famous passages, therefore, are not a record of what *had* been done already, but of what *might* be done when they should come to possess the country of old Canaan; avoid this conclusion he that can.

But further, we shall show the marks of a reckless hand, as detailed in the pamphlet above alluded to, where the Scriptures are shown up, as affording no reproof for certain wicked actions of certain wicked men, as held by abolitionists, such as *Noah* in his drunkenness, *Lot* in his incest, and the lies of *Jacob* and his mother, as well as the polygamy of the patriarchs; all of which are entered as a mere record without censure, says this writer.

But such is not the fact; for the Scriptures say that *no* drunkard can inherit the kingdom of heaven, 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10, nor incestuous person or fornicator. In Deut. xxi, 20, it is said, that if a son was a **** *drunkard*, he should be stoned to death. This is a reproof of those crimes with a vengeance.

We could multiply, even from the *Old* Testament, reproofs for sins of the kinds above named.

As to *polygamy*, the Scriptures do no where say that a man might have more than one wife, neither in the Old nor the New Testament. By the Savior, it is strictly or impliedly forbidden, Matt. xix, 5—8; and was it not the Savior, Jesus Christ, who gave the law from Sinai to Moses and the Jews? Is it likely, therefore, that Christ in the law would allow polygamy by a direct precept, when he has said, in the

verses above quoted, that from the *beginning* it was not so?

It is true, however, that Moses, in the law, did suppose (Deut. xxi, 15) the case of a man having *two* wives, and has there prescribed certain regulations respecting the children of such wives, but does not, in so many words, any where say that his people might have more wives than one at a time, nor had Moses himself ever but one wife. It is true, also, that he gave a power to the Jews to put away a wife by divorce, who did not please them; but even this allowance was done out of mercy to the woman; for on this very subject Jesus Christ said that Moses allowed it to be done on account of the *hardness* of their *hearts*, or cruelty to their wives: but from the beginning it was not true that a man might have a plurality of wives. On this subject, the Savior founds his argument against polygamy, namely, that God, or *himself*, who was God, in the beginning made them *male* and *female*, and married them to each other, adding, that as God had put them together by marriage, that no man could, legally or morally, put them asunder, except for but *one* cause only. Are we, therefore, to imagine that the author of both codes of law, the *Gospel* and the *Pentateuch*, would thus contradict his own eternal views of morality? Accordingly, there is found no such admission in the law of Moses, but exactly the contrary.

It is true, however, that polygamy was practiced to a great extent during all the ages of the Jewish history; but the writer of these pages is not prepared to say that the *law* of God allowed it, or that the

Scriptures, even of the Old Testament, have not reproved it, but *otherwise;* for it is written by *Nehemiah*, xiii, 26, that Solomon, who had many wives, *sinned* against God and his own soul by doing so. This passage we consider a direct censure of the practice, as well as the remarks of the Savior, in Matt. xix, 5, who said that it was not so from the beginning, and, consequently, could not have been allowed in the *old* law. See Deut. xvii, 17, where it is written, that when the people of the Hebrews should come to possess the country of Canaan, and they should desire a king, one from among their *brethren* of the twelve tribes, he was not to *multiply* wives. Two is a multiplication of one. More wives than *one*, therefore, was forbidden by the law of Moses, and although that good trait of the law was never so much violated in that respect by all the Jews under heaven in those ages, yet this does not make it out that the Scriptures allowed polygamy, or did not *reprove* the practice as a sin.

But the author of the note above alluded to appears willing to have it pass that the Scriptures do not reprove sin, especially in the Old Testament, even though the sins were *drunkenness*, *polygamy*, *incest* and *lying*, but merely speaks of them as a simple *entry* or *record* of such deeds and acts. This mighty stretch of opinion is introduced in order that the reader may be led to believe that when Moses, in the law, has said that the Hebrews should buy their bond men of the heathen, has only made a *record* of that great crime in this particular. To carry out and to impress this belief, the author of that

series of pamphlets and of the *note* in question, does not hesitate to call Noah a *drunkard*, and Lot an *incestuous* person—two men, among *five*, of the *most* holy named on the pages of the divine oracles.

But as it relates to these two men, *Noah* and *Lot*, we maintain that they were not sinners in the alledged transactions. Noah, as we have said before, was an aged man, being over six hundred years old when he drank the wine spoken of by Moses, Gen. ix, 21; its effects, therefore, were undoubtedly wholly unforeseen by him, as by that time the iron nerves of his youth and maturer years were beginning to be reduced by weakness and the disabilities of age. A very little wine, therefore, might have disposed him to *sleep*, a condition far enough from a *debauch*, or an intended wreckless inebriation: if so, then he was no sinner in that affair, nor does the Scriptures intimate any such thing.

Had Noah been wickedly intoxicated, is it likely that the Holy Ghost would have communed with and inspired him, respecting the fortunes of mankind, who were to descend from his three sons, whose every word, on that occasion, Heaven had seen fit to fulfill? *Never*.

Neither was Lot a sinner, in the affair of his daughters; for the Scriptures plainly state (Gen. xix, 33–35), that when his daughters appoached him in an improper way, *he perceived it not*, when they lay down with him, nor when they arose. There was no sin, therefore, in that transaction, on the part of *Lot*, as his *mind* did not consent to the deed, nor his perceptions take cognizance of the act. As to his

drinking too much on that occasion, there can be no doubt but his daughters contrived some way to deceive him, by mixing wine with his food, or drink of water, till he became senseless.

As to the case of *Jacob*, in the matter of his lying to his father, when he said that *he* was the man *Esau*, this was far enough from being a good act, but was actually a wicked one.

But was not this sin *reproved* during the night, in which he slept on the mountain, at which time he was converted to God by the operation of the Holy Ghost, when he had the dream of the celestial ladder, and when he awoke and said: "*God is in this place, and I knew it not.*" Gen. xxviii, 16.

SURELY, this account is something more than a mere silent entry of the sin of lying, as it is a *tacit* record at least of the reproof, for how could it be pardoned except reproved and repented of? And besides, do not the Divine oracles every where reprove all liars, and in the New Testament threaten them with hell fire?

Thus briefly have we endeavored to rescue the character of the Bible, and the characters of two good and holy men, Noah and Lot, from the aspersions of a lawless pen—which pen, for no other purpose in the world, than by any means to get it to be believed that Moses did not, in the law, allow of direct slavery, has been willing thus to write, and to mystify the minds of readers, attempting to show that Moses, in all that he has said on the subject of slavery, has merely made a record of the crime, without reproof; though, as it happened, the crime was

not perpetrated till some forty years or more after the record was made, as above remarked.

But we pass from this to another particular opinion of the author of "The Bible against Slavery." See No. 6 of this series of pamphlets, year 1838, p. 17, and onward to the end of the chapter, where the word BUY, as used by Moses, in relation to the Hebrews making slaves of the Canaanites by purchase, is shown by that writer, according to *his* mode of reasoning, to mean, after all, nothing but to *hire*, instead of buy. Vast pains are taken by the writer of that work to show that because the word *buy* is sometimes used in the Scripture phraseology in application to some things which could not be sold, as wisdom, &c., that therefore, the word *buy*, as used by Moses, when he said the Hebrews might buy the children of the heathen negroes for slaves, did not mean *purchase*, but rather signified a reciprocal *contract*, entered into between the parents of such children and adult persons thus bought, and was, therefore, but a conditional bargain after all, which, if not fulfilled on the part of the *buyer*, rendered the bargain *null* and *void*.

Could this position be fairly sustained, the fact of real slavery, as supposed to have been practiced among the Hebrews, by the authority of their *law*, would cease to exist; but thus Moses does not state the case. In relation to bondmen, there was *no* condition, except that if a master should in anger smite out a *tooth* or an *eye* of his servant, then he might go free for his tooth or his eye's sake, but there was no other condition by which he could go free, in the eye

of that law, or be absolved from the condition of a slave or legal property.

If they were but once bought, they became perpetual slaves, to be inherited by the heirs of those who bought them, and of *necessity* liable to be sold again, whenever the owner should please to do so. This is the full, complete and unambiguous meaning of the 46th verse of the xxvth of Leviticus, and all the *parallel* places in the book of the law. Thus reads the passage: "*And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever!*"

The words *inherit* and *possession* are *here* used in the same property-sense in no wise differing from their use, when spoken in the promise of God to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the Hebrews, respecting the *possession* of the land of Canaan, which was to be their real *inheritance* and possession forever, as soon as the time should come when they should enter upon it by conquest. This was all in *futurity* when promised, as it respected the land of the Canaanites; so also was the promise of the bodies of the inhabitants for slaves—one was equally as much a promise as was the other—of such as should not be slain in the subjugation of the country: there was no difference.

Now, to carry out this notion of the above mentioned pamphlets on the idea of the word *buy*, or possession, being no more than the word *hire* or contract, then the promised possession of the country of Canaan would, after all, amount to nothing more than to *rent* it, while the fee simple would have still re-

mained in the hands of the Canaanites, who, instead of being slaves, and the possession of the Hebrews, would in reality have been the *lords* of the Hebrews.

The promise of the country of Canaan to the progeny of Abraham by Isaac, is multiplied in the old Scriptures almost without end, in the words *inheritance*, possession, &c. Were those words making out those promises used in a delusive or uncertain sense, as if the possession of that country by the Hebrews, depended on the *acquiescence* of the Canaanites; but if not, *then* are the *same* words as used by Moses in the law, giving the persons of the Canaanites to be an *inheritance* and a *possession* of the *same* force and meaning that they are when used in relation to the *land*, notwithstanding the dodging of abolition writers about the words BUY and sell.

If the sense of this word, *buy*, in its most ordinary meaning, is turned aside in its application to the case in hand, then in a moment a multitude of the Scripture history of transactions between buyers and sellers, are rendered uncertain and doubtful. To give a few cases in prosecution of the idea, as follows:

The sons of Jacob went to Egypt to *buy* corn for their families—Gen. xlii, 2. Jacob *bought* a field of the Shechemites, in the land of Canaan, long before the time of Moses, for a hundred pieces of money—Gen. xxxiii, 18, 19. There also was the case of Joseph, who was *sold* to the Ishmaelites, for twenty pieces of silver—Gen. xxxvii, 28; who was again *sold* to Potiphar, in Egypt—Gen. xxxix, 1.

In process of time, this Joseph bought all the land of Egypt, from the Egyptians, for the king, on ac-

count of the famine—Gen. xlvii, 20. In all these cases the usual terms of *buy* and *sell* as commonly applied in traffic, are resorted to, although one of these cases was the sale of the body and person of a man, namely, Joseph, or the thing bought, the same as any other goods or chattels.

During this famine, Joseph not only bought all the land of Egypt, but he also bought the Egyptians themselves, men, women and children, for corn.

Respecting the case of the Egyptians, we will give the whole account, that the reader may judge whether Joseph did actually buy the Egyptians as a man would buy any thing else. See Gen. xlvii, from the 15th to the 26th verse inclusive.

And when money failed in all the land of Egypt, all the Egyptians came to Joseph, and said: give us corn, for why should we die in thy presence, for the money faileth. And Joseph said, *give* your cattle, and I will *give* you food for your cattle if money fail [was not *this* a goods and chattels bargain?]. And they brought their cattle unto Joseph, and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses—and he bought with bread all the cattle that year.

But to this account, Josephus adds, that with the cattle Joseph *bought* all their slaves. From this fact, it appears that the Egyptians had slaves, and that they sold them to Joseph, who did not refuse to buy them, which, had it been a *sin* to do so, as abolitionists contend, he would not have done it, famine or no famine.

But the story is not yet finished; for when the year was at an end, and their bread was gone, for which they had given their cattle and slaves, they came unto Joseph and said, "We will not hide it, how that our money is spent, also thou hast our herds of cattle; there is not aught left in the sight of our lord but our bodies and our lands. Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both *we* and our lands; *buy us* and our land for bread, and *we* and our land will be servants [slaves] unto Pharaoh. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt, for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them, so that the land became Pharaoh's; and as for the people, he removed them to cities, from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof," having a right to do this in virtue of his *purchase* of their bodies.

Surely this was a *bona fide* contract, equally so with any other bargain, where the money is paid for the thing bought. And why should not this have been so, as there is no doubt but the king's money, during the seven years of plenty, had bought, by the management of Joseph, all the grain the Egyptians had to spare, which he laid up in the granaries of the country.

This grain, therefore, was the property of the king, and it could not be parted with without an equivalent, and that equivalent was had in *money*, *cattle*, *slaves*, *land*, and finally the *bodies* of the Egyptians themselves, by which means they became even the slaves of Pharaoh.

But out of that condition, the generosity of their

king, at the suggestion of his chief minister, Joseph the Hebrew, delivered them by making them an offer. This offer was, that they should receive *seed* at his hand, and should sow the land with that seed, and should forever thereafter give to Pharaoh one-fifth of the increase as the price of their redemption. That this was a generous offer, and one which they might think themselves happy to have made to them, is shown from the remarks of Joseph on the occasion, which were as follows—Gen. xlvii, 23, "Then Joseph said unto the people, behold I have *bought you* this day, and your land for Pharaoh: lo! here is seed, and ye *shall* sow the land. And it shall come to pass, in the increase, that you *shall* give the *fifth* unto Pharaoh, and four parts *shall* be your own for the seed of the field, and for your food, and for your household, and for food for your little ones."

Was this a reciprocal agreement between Pharaoh and the people?—*never*. It was a case of the most perfect dictation on the part of the *owner* of the people, in which, for a return of the money that had been laid out for grain during the seven years' famine, Pharaoh said I *will have* one-fifth of the increase of the land for ever (which in all time before was not the case) as an equivalent for my money and its interest.

But what said the Egyptians to this *mandate*? Did they *higgle* at it, as men will do in making bargains, when the parties are independent of each other? *No*, they did not, as there was no alternative; but replied, as the most abject suppliants, "*Thou* hast saved our lives; let us find *grace* in the sight of our

lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants." Here the people were set free from absolute slavery, and exalted to the character of *vassals*, or renters of the land, which was not their condition prior to the famine—the revenues of the government having been collected in some other way.

If it were a true solution of the matter that the word *buy* signified, in ancient times, and in the Hebrew language, the law of Moses, &c., no more than to *hire*, excluding a *third* person in such a transaction, *then* it would follow that the *corn* which the sons of Jacob bought in Egypt was only *hired;* the parcel of land *bought* by Jacob of the Shechemites, for a certain price in silver, was only *hired;* the *cave* bought by Abraham of the children of Heth for a place of burial, for so much money by *weight*, was only *hired;* when Joseph was sold by his brethren to the Midianites, who bought him for twenty pieces of silver, it was nothing, after all, but *hiring* him out to those merchants.

Were *this* the true sense of the Scriptural word *buy*, then, indeed, as the abolitionists contend in their writings, all the *bondmen* of the negro race of old Canaan were but so many *hired* men and hired maids to the Hebrews. As to the word *buy*, in all languages, no matter how it is spoken, or how it sounds, the *true* and highest meaning of the word signifies to *purchase* any thing human beings traffic in. No matter what the article *is*, as the power of custom is able to make any thing an article of trade which is *tangible*—a human being, an ox, or a piece of land. After this, its first, highest and radical

meaning, there are a number of other matters to which the word *buy* can be applied, and are called its *accommodated*, or secondary uses or meanings. For instance, a person's *education* may cost *much* money, and yet, as education is not a tangible thing, it cannot be *sold;* and still it may be said that education was *bought*, even with money. But this is not strictly and literally true after all, as all the money in the world cannot *buy* a man an education; it is to be obtained only by *intellectual* exertions and individual study. In a case like this, therefore, the words *buy* and *bought* are used only in their secondary, figurative, or accommodated uses.

In this way it is said in Scripture, that men should *buy* wisdom and *sell* it not; that is, do not make an unwise or a foolish use of wisdom, or cast it not away. In relation to the means of man's salvation, it is said that we are *bought* with a price, but not with money; and yet we are actually *bought* from immediate death, and eternal non-existence, in the loins of Adam when he fell, by the blood of the promised Messiah, *prospectively* shed for the race of man before the world was made; or we should never have had any existence at all, Adam and Eve alone excepted.

The practice of the Jews, in paying to the priesthood of their worship *redemption* money for their souls (see Numbers xviii, 15, and iii, 45, 51), was in some sense, no doubt, a *typical* thing—alluding to the need every man has of a Redeemer's *blood* to save his soul, and was also given in support of the worship of the altar, where Jehovah was adored.

Now, what though money was paid in this and the *other* cases, as mentioned above, yet there was no transaction of the *trafficking* character, as is the fact when men buy and sell articles of *tangible* natures, the words *buy*, *bought* and *sell* being used here only in their secondary, accommodated or emblematical senses, and applied to moral or abstract subjects, and not to things tangible.

According to the law of Moses, just referred to, the first born of all the Hebrews was to be redeemed with *money*, which went to support the priesthood. Out of this fact, or from this fact, abolitionists, in their writings, *will* have it, that if the word *buy*, as used in Leviticus, 25th chapter, related to the *purchase* of bondmen from among the heathen Canaanites, by which they became *property*, that it ought to have the *same* meaning in the case of the redemption of the first born among the Hebrews, because they were redeemed with *money*, and were, therefore, as *much bought* as were the *bondmen* alluded to in Leviticus, and, of necessity, were equally an article of property.

But all this reasoning of theirs is but nonsense, of the poorest description—a mere shuffling of mixed up and confused ideas. This is apparent when we come to know who it was that were required thus to redeem the first born children at the hand of the priest. It was the parents who were required to do this, who could not, and *did* not thereby increase their right to their own children; neither could the priest seize and sell such children as were not thus redeemed; it was a sin of omission, to be punished by the Divine hand, and not by man, if the money

was not paid at the altar, for their *souls'* typical redemption.

Because the parents were required *thus* to redeem their children, in reference to God and the blood of the to be crucified Messiah, who was to come, therein acknowledging that they were bought *prospectively*, by the anticipated death of Christ, could in no possible way make bought slaves of such children, nor increase the natural or moral right the parents had to their offspring as Hebrews. Therefore, a parity of reasoning, as argued by abolitionists, cannot apply to the argument, as it respects the actual purchase of slaves, or to the word *buy*, as if this word could be tortured into the word *redeem*, as used in relation to the first born among the Hebrews. For arguments of this description, see "*The Bible against Slavery*," No. 6, year 1838, page 18, and onward.

It is asserted by abolitionists, that between the *buyer* and the person *bought*, as spoken of, Leviticus xxv, whether it related to *Hebrew* servants, or to *bond servants*, bought of the heathen Canaanites, that there *was* a mutual *stipulating* between the parties—the *buyer* and the person *bought*. But this is not true; as no Hebrew person who was sold for debt, for theft, or for any other legal reason, had a word to say on the subject, as dictating the sale. For it was the *law* which sold the man or the woman, and not *themselves;* it was the *law* that did this, as it would sell, by the means of an auctioneer, any article of property now-a-days at auction; there was no other way to sell a delinquent debtor or a criminal. How, therefore, could the delinquent stipulate at all in the matter?

There is a case, however, stated in this same chapter, the 25th of Leviticus, occupying from the 47th to the 55th verse inclusive, where it is shown that a *poor* Hebrew might sell himself to his rich neighbor, in which, no doubt, there was, of *necessity*, and also of propriety, a stipulating of terms on the part of the man selling himself and the man who might buy him: *this* case we cannot see differed any way from a man hiring himself out till such time as his wages should pay the debt, or to the end of his life, if he would, as have many, in all ages. But if by any means he could redeem himself, or if his relations could redeem him, then they or he might do so, even though the time agreed on was not yet expired. But what has this case to do, or indeed *any* case of the Hebrew servitude, with the case of Canaanitish *bondmen?* We answer—nothing at all, in any possible way, so far as the *law* has any thing to say about it.

In relation to servants of the *Hebrew* character, in the law of Moses, there were many mitigating circumstances; but as to the negro or Canaanite bondman there was *none*, as it related to compensation in the light of wages, or of promised freedom [except the eye and tooth case]: not even the jubilees could reach their condition, as *their* state of servitude was to be for ever, from generation to generation—they were to be the everlasting possession or property of the Hebrews, their masters, to be disposed of by *will*, by sales, by gifts, or in any such way.

There is, in the law of Moses, a very great distinction made between the *stranger* servant, the bought Hebrew servant, the *hired* Hebrew servant, and the

bond servant of the Canaanites, as was proper; for *all* the other kinds of servants were, in some way, of the Hebrew or Abrahamic lineage, descended through various channels from the blood of SHEM, as before shown; who were not to be oppressed as slaves and ruled over with rigor, in that particular, as were the *bond* servants of the Canaanitish or negro race.

But, says one who may be opposed to the views of the writer of this book, did not the great jubilee of the Jews, which took place every fiftieth year, set all slaves free? And does not the law positively refer to the case of *bondmen* of the Canaanitish description, who were slaves among the Hebrews? To this we answer, that the great jubilee had nothing to do with slaves or their liberties, in any way whatever. Our reasons for this belief we shall give as soon as we have read the law on the subject of the great jubilee and its immunities. See Leviticus xxv, 8—10, 13, as follows:

"And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years, and the space of seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim *liberty*, throughout all the land, unto *all* the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his family. In the year of this jubilee, ye shall return every *man* to his possession."

That this great jubilee did not refer to the case of slaves or bond servants, we learn from the fact that slaves had no possessions in the country at all; and as the Hebrews, at the time the law was given, were instructed, in the very decalogue itself, to destroy and dispossess all the Canaanites of their country, when they should begin to enter upon it, by war and conquest, how, therefore, could the jubilee, in its phraseology, have had the least allusion to that people, in their favor? The supposition is wholly untenable.

But to the Hebrews, one and all, who should sell or lose their family possession of land, the jubilee should be their great emancipator and restorer of their rights. THIS, and nothing but this, was the liberty proclaimed to all the inhabitants, as reads the 10th verse above quoted, which is qualified or explained in the 13th, and relates only to land, and the impoverished Hebrews who were to return "*every man to his possession.*" But the Canaanites, in the view of the law, had no possession in the land of Canaan at all, nor families in the eyes of the law. How, therefore, can it be supposed that the immunities of the greater jubilee could reach the case of any other race than the Hebrews themselves? *Overturn this conclusion he that can.*

Thus, as we believe, the passage on which abolitionists rely so securely for the freedom of Canaanitish bondmen in the law, every great jubilee, is fairly taken out of their hands, and that by absolute logical demonstration. In relation to this matter, abolitionists have cast much dust of sophistry into the great

arcanum of public opinion and belief, arguing and contending that the institutions of Moses made no difference between the condition of *Hebrew* servants and the negro *bond* men of the Canaanitish description; and have striven to cover the *latter* with the immunities and privileges of the former, as if there really was no difference intended in that law.

The *rigor*, so often alluded to in the law of Moses, which might be exercised upon *bond* servants of the Canaanitish or heathen race, but not on servants of the Hebrews, we do not understand to have consisted of personal abuse or torture, either by hunger, stripes, mutilations, or *improper* exposures of life or limb; for the law forbade this, where it is written, that if a master knocked out a tooth, or an eye of his servant, he should go free on those accounts, as is stated in Exodus xxi, 26, 27; and *yet* it is written in the same chapter, namely, the xxi, at the 20th and 22d verses, that "if a man smite his (man) servant, or his (maid) servant, with a rod, and he (or she) die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he (or she) continue a day or two, he shall *not* be punished, for he was his *money*.

From this text, it is almost impossible to deny that the law did but little in defense of the personal and physical happiness of *bond* servants among the Hebrews; there is no way to avoid this conclusion, as the texts to this point, either direct or indirect, are numerous.

But no such treatment is allowed of in the law toward *Hebrew* servants, as it is strictly forbidden to oppress them, or to rule over them with rigor in any

way, because *they* were *brethren* to their masters, and not to be treated as *hired* men.

The *bondman* was unknown in law; he had no civil rights, no voice in community—could not be a witness in courts of law or religion—could not implead the master in cases of abuse or disagreement, but was wholly at the will of his owner. But such was not the case with the Hebrew servants—as their condition of servitude did not disenfranchize them as citizens, in any degree whatever, as they were not to be oppressed as bond servants might be. This, as above, was the *rigor* which was not, and could not, be brought to bear upon *any other* class of servants among the Hebrews, but the Hamite race alone, according to the law of Moses and the curse of Noah.

As to any national privilege, of which a *bond servant* might partake among the Hebrews, there was but *one*, and this was in the matter of religion. A bond servant being circumcised, might eat of the passover, the sign of the common salvation of man; but in other respects this circumstance did not benefit the slaves any more than their embracing Christianity in the days of the apostles benefited them, as to their temporal condition; upon which we shall treat in due time before we close these pages. In relation to this point, see Exodus xii, 44, 45, "But every man's servant that is *bought* with *money*, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof;" that is, he might eat of the *passover*, and that was all that was in his favor, except rest on the sabbath day, the same as the cattle.

As to the Hebrews trafficking in the sale and pur-

chase of slaves, it is contended by abolitionists that they did *not*, and that no sale of the kind can be found in the Scriptures. On this account, therefore, they assume that such transactions were abhorrent to the genius of the law and religion of Moses. But to refute this notion, we have only to refer to Exodus xxi, 7—11, where, in a certain case, which the reader can examine for himself, it is said that a man who might buy a maid servant of a Hebrew father, and if she did not please him (the purchaser), then he might let her be redeemed, to get his money again which she had cost him; but "*to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power.*"

Now, from the very prohibition itself, we infer that the practice of the Hebrews selling the poor of their own people to other nations, was in vogue at the time of the giving of the law, and even while they were yet in Egypt; but in the *new* law given from Sinai, *this* was forbidden. If this was not the case, would God, by the hand of Moses, have instituted laws against practices and abuses, which did not and could never exist. Therefore, as God foreknew that as soon as the Hebrews should get possession of the country of Canaan, they would deal in the purchase and sale of the Canaanites, according to the law he was then giving them by the hand of Moses, he straightly forbade them to indulge in this thing toward their *brethren*, the Hebrews, saying that they should *not* sell each other to a *strange* nation as they might the Canaanites, while he left no such mandate on record respecting the people of *Ham*, who were then the aborigines of old Canaan,

whither for war and conquest the twelve tribes were bound.

Moses and the tribes were yet in the desert when the law was given, which said, on the subject of servants, by way of anticipation, that when they should come into the promised land, and should have servants of their *own* blood, and should deal in selling them among themselves (as it appears they did from Exodus xxi, 7), that they should make a distinction between Hebrew servants and servants of the Canaanitish description; the *former*, they might deal in among themselves *only* in the way the law directed, but the *latter* they might sell to whom they would, to strange nations and all: there should, in *this* respect, be no prohibition, as there was, and should be, in the other—the Hebrew servants.

The selling of bondmen, by and among the Hebrews, appears from *another* clause in the law of Moses, and is of similar import with the one just now cited; it prohibited their dealing in slaves or servants of their *own blood* in the *same way* they might deal in slaves of the negro character. See Leviticus xxv, 42, as follows: "For they (the Hebrews) are *my servants* which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall *not* be sold as *bond* men," or as absolute slaves.

By this mode of phraseology, what else can be understood than that while the Hebrews were forbidden to sell their own blood as *bondmen* out of the country, they might, however, buy and sell *heathen* negro men for *bond* men, and thus traffic in them as an article of trade or commerce. Surely the practice is

tacitly, if not emphatically, admitted in the clause just above quoted out of the law of God.

But to make the fact still more clear, namely, that the Jews did actually deal in slaves of the negro race, see the Book of JOEL, third chapter, where it is shown that because the *Tyrians*, *Zidonians*, and people of *Palestine*, who were of the same race with those just named, being all Hamites of old Canaan, had abused the Hebrews while captives among them at a certain time, by ridicule, and by selling their little ones at drinking houses for *wine*, and at houses of ill-fame for the purpose of riot and *lewdness*, that they should *themselves* be sold by the Jews in their turn, as a *recompense*, or as a *judgment* on their own heads, for having done so great a deed of wickedness.

But, says one, if it was wicked for the people of Tyre and Zidonia to sell the little children of the Jews, why was it not just as wicked for the Jews to sell the Zidonians, and the people of Canaan? To solve this question, you must ask the determining councils and judgments of God, which, on *this* subject, are all set down in the great record of his doings toward *that* race of men, namely, the Scriptures, and are his *judicial* acts concerning them.

The passages in the Book of Joel, above alluded to, read as follows: "For, behold in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehosaphat (or the field of battle), and will plead with them there, for my people and my heritage Israel, whom they [the Tyrians and Zidonians] have scattered

among the nations, and parted my land. And they have cast lots for my people, and have given a *boy* for an *harlot*, and *sold* a girl for *wine*, that they might drink. Yea, and what have ye to do with me, O Tyre and Zidon, and all the coast of Palestine? will ye render me a recompense? and if ye recompense (yet) swiftly and speedily will I return your recompense upon your own head: because ye have taken my silver and my gold, and have carried them into your temples, my goodly pleasant things: the children also of Judah, and the children of Jerusalem, have ye *sold* unto the *Grecians* [a great way to the west], that ye might remove them far from their border. Behold, I will raise them out of the place, whither ye have *sold* them, and will return your recompense [or doings] upon your own heads. And I will *sell* your sons and your daughters into the hands of the children of Judah, and *they* shall *sell* them to the *Sabeans*, a people far off; for the Lord hath spoken it."

Here it is certainly stated that the Jews *might*, and actually *should*, sell the people of Palestine, who were of the race of Ham, the heathen negroes of old Canaan, which was fulfilled as follows: The Jews had been made in great numbers prisoners of war, and carried away into captivity by the Tyrians prior to the time of JOEL the *Prophet*, and were sold to the *Grecians*, who dwelt about the western end of the Mediterranean, now known as Spain and Italy, far west of Judea, but were released by Alexander the Great, who was a Greek, and by his successors, when they returned again to Judea. But when this great

warrior had made a conquest of *Tyre*, which the reader will not forget was a Canaanitish city and kingdom, he reduced all the lower orders of the people to a state of slavery, men, women, and children, amounting to 30,000 at one time, who were sold on the spot to whosoever would buy them. And besides *this*, when Artaxerxes-Ochus destroyed Zidon, another city of old Canaan, and had reduced the captives to be sold as slaves, the *Jews*, as JOEL had foretold, were present, and *bought* as many as they could, and sold them again to the *Sabeans*, a people dwelling far to the east of old Phœnicia or Palestine, in Arabia-deserta, bordering on the sea of Arabia, which is an arm or bay of the Indian ocean, a distance of full 600 miles from Zidonia, their native country, among which people they are slaves to this day, as also in both Indies, Hindostan, and in all Asia.

Here we see the Jews, by the direct providence of God, in the fulfillment of the prophesy of *Joel*, as well as in accordance with the law of Moses, and the curse of Noah, speculating in the *purchase* and *sale* of vast droves of the negroes of Tyre and Zidon, as is often done, now-a-days, with the same race of people in the United States, and parts of Europe, notwithstanding the recent agreement among the powers of Christendom, making it piracy to do so; so careful is the Divine veracity of its own honor.

Is *this* account, as above given, from the Holy Scriptures, respecting the buying and selling of the progeny of Ham by the Jews, to be looked upon as "*a mere silent entry*," made by the prophet Joel, of the wicked deeds and acts of those Jews, as abolition-

ists would say it was, when both prophesy and Providence, as well as the *direct mandate* of God on the subject, are all seen engaged together to accomplish it, and it was accomplished?

But, says one, what *was* the *mandate* of God on the subject above alluded to? It was this: God said by the mouth of *Joel*, one of his prophets, that the Jews, *should* absolutely sell the blacks of old Tyre to the *Sabeans* (red men), and they did it accordingly as God had determined they should.

Who, after reading and considering these cases, as presented on the pages above, will still object, and say, that in the Scriptures there is no account found, where a Hebrew, Jew, or Israelite, sold again the slave that he had bought.

But in pursuit of the same subject, namely, that the Jews did traffic in slaves, we are able to prove that SOLOMON, the wisest king who ever sat on a throne, the great and good monarch of the twelve tribes, actually carried on a regular trade in slaves from countries very far from Judea, where he resided, as well also as in Canaan, or the Holy Land.

In proof of this, see Antiquities of the Jews, by Josephus, book 8, chapter 7, page 293, as follows: "King Solomon had many ships that lay upon the sea of Tarsus (the Red Sea); these he commanded to carry out all sorts of merchandise unto the remotest nations, by the sale of which, silver and gold were brought to the king, and a great quantity of ivory, apes, and *Ethiopians;* and they finished their voyage, going and returning, in three years' time."

Josephus is not alone in this, for the Rabbi say the same thing, that is, that the ships of Solomon went to *Africa* (Clarke), and as he possessed many thousands of black slaves of the Canaanite character, what, in his mind, could therefore arise, as an objection to his adding to the number of the same race of men, though procured from a distant country, or the places of their nativity. 2 Chron. ix, 21. In the wars the Jews had with the Ethiopians and Lybians, from Africa, as in the case of *Asa*, one of the kings of Judah, about 900 years B. C. See 2 Chronicles, chap. xiv. In that war, ZERAH, the black king of Ethiopia, had a million of men, with whom he invaded Judea, and was wholly defeated by Asa, for *God* fought the battle. All the prisoners of this incomprehensible host were taken and held as slaves, which was the usage of war in those times.

But if the word *Ethiopian*, as used by Josephus, to the mind of any reader, should not exactly prove that negroes or black men were alluded to by him, we will state that the *American* folio edition of Josephus says *negroes*, instead of Ethiopians, which, in reality, are but two words meaning the same thing; making it clear, beyond all controversy, that Solomon did trade in negroes bought in foreign countries, from those who had them to sell, or Josephus is no authority.

But the authenticity of Josephus cannot be doubted, in relation to the voyages spoken of by that historian, for the account is corroborated by the Scriptures: see 1 Kings x, 22, where those voyages are specifically described. And besides this traffic of his

from foreign countries, the land of Ophir, &c., Solomon made slaves of tens of thousands of the blacks of old Canaan, while building the temple, his own house, and *Tadmor* in the desert, the store *cities*, and *Hamath*, the upper and lower *Bethoran*, fenced cities, with walls, gates, and bars, as well as *Belath*, all great and magnificent works, of immense cost and labor, the ruins of which are seen at the present day, especially those of *Tadmor* of the desert.

Solomon was not ignorant of the judicial act of God, as made known by the mouth of *Noah*, respecting the descendants of Ham, nor of the law of Moses, which indorsed that judicial enactment by the ministry of angels, respecting the people of the blacks, in their exposedness to, and fitness for, slavery. He was not ignorant of *Joshua's* opinion on the same subject, as expressed when that renowned warrior told the Gibeonites, who were one of the tribes of the race of Ham, in Canaan, that they were *cursed*, and never to be freed from being bondmen or slaves.

That king Solomon had slaves in abundance, is written by his own hand, which writing is still extant, and that he bought them is also stated by him, and that from the slaves thus bought, or otherwise procured in the negro countries, he raised others, as do the owners of slaves at the present time.

For the proof of the above, see Ecclesiastes ii, 7, as follows: "I got me *servants* and *maidens*, and had *servants* born in my house."

Now, Solomon was a *preacher*, or a *minister* of religion, as well as a king, as he calls himself *thus* in chap. i, verse 1, of Eccl., and if *such* a man had

slaves of the *negro* race (as to enslave any other people was not tolerated by their law), why is it that ministers of religion at the present time may not also have them if they desire it? The possession of *property* was never abrogated to the Jews by the edicts of the Gospel, and as slaves, were esteemed property by them in every age of their existence; the abrogating power of the *new* dispensation, therefore, had no more to do with the slave question *then*, nor *now*, than it had with any property, or any other subject not embraced in the ritual of the Jewish religion; *this* is the very reason why St. Paul, nor any of the writers of the New Testament, no, not even Christ himself, did not meddle with that subject, otherwise than to admonish, or *command*, that masters of slaves should treat them with kindness.

In the above scripture it is seen that Solomon speaks of his *possessions* of cattle and slaves, all in one verse, in no way varying either the *sense* or the phraseology, making no distinction, but amalgamates them together as an item in the amount of his prodigious wealth.

But not only Solomon procured slaves from Africa, but all the kings of the East, the Chaldeans, the Medes, Persians, Assyrians, Arabians, &c., which is intimated in the xixth and xxth chapters of Isaiah, as follows: "In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to *Assyria*, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall *serve* with the Assyrians." In this verse their state of slavery is more than intimated, which they were to endure among the Assyrians as slaves.

But in the xxth chapter, verses 3 and 4, the fact of their being enslaved by those eastern powers is plainly stated, as follows: "And the Lord said, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot three years for a sign and a wonder upon *Egypt* and upon Ethiopia; so shall the king of Assyria lead away the *Egyptians prisoners*, and the Ethiopians *captives*, young and old, *naked* and barefoot, even with their *buttocks* uncovered to the shame of Egypt."

Thus we see that in all ages, Africa has been the great *breeding* house of slaves for all mankind, for at this day all Asia is full of negro slaves, the descendants of the slaves of those first ages, procured from old Canaan and Africa.

For an account of the almost countless number of Canaanitish bondmen employed in the works of Solomon, see book of Joshua ix, 23, and 2 Chron. ii, 17, 18. See also 1 Kings ix, 20–22, for an account of the *bond* service, levied by Solomon upon the *Amorites*, *Hivites*, *Perizzites*, *Hittites* and *Jebusites*, who were all of the black race of the Canaanites, the sons of Ham.

According to Josephus, book viii, p. 21, Solomon took the tribute due to him from a certain district of old Canaan situate between Lybanus and the city Ametha, in *slaves*, so many a year; these were the blacks of that country.

It appears, therefore, that Solomon considered it right to enslave and oppress in this respect, the race of Ham wherever he could find them, whether in old Canaan, Africa, or any where else, except he was in league or compact, by treaty, as appears to have been

the case between him and Hiram, the king of Tyre, at that particular time, and in that district over which he then reigned.

Now, for all *this*, we do not find that Solomon was reproved, as he was for some other acts of his life; there arises, therefore, from this fact, namely, that of his *not* being reproved for enslaving the negro race, a strong evidence that the Jews, their kings, priests, prophets, elders, patriarchs, rulers and people, held it to be right, and in perfect harmony with the law of Moses, to enslave that race wherever they existed, except in cases of compacts or treaties, as in the case of *Tyre*, and the king of *Egypt*, with whom Solomon had leagues of amity, for the time being.

No nation of the globe has equalled the Jews, in the enslaving of the negro nations (except the negroes themselves), for even Moses assisted in reducing one of the fiercest of the nations who opposed him and the Hebrews in their progress toward the land of Canaan, to personal and literal slavery; these were the Amalekites, dwelling on the wilderness side of Canaan, toward Egypt on the south.

This was done after the famous battle fought between the Hebrews and the Amalekites, over which Moses presided, when *Hur* and *Aaron* supported his arms, as he held out toward the contending armies from the top of the mountain, the fatal spear—see Exod. xvii, 12. The prisoners then taken in that conflict were reduced to personal slavery, and that under the eye and approval of Moses; which, had it been wrong, or a sin, would then and there have been rebuked, as God allowed of no heinous or pub-

lic crime in the camp of the Hebrews, to go unpunished and reproved on the spot.

But how is it proved that Moses did this, seeing the Bible does not mention the circumstance? It is proven by Josephus. See his Jewish Antiquities, book iii, chap. ii, p. 85, who there says, that the victory then won, "was the occasion of their (the Hebrews) prosperity, not only for the present, but for future ages also; for they not only made *slaves* of the *bodies* of their enemies, but effectually damped their minds, and after the battle, the Hebrews became terrible to all that dwelt round about them."

Even the temple of God had its slaves of the negro and Canaanitish race, who were called the *Nethinims* or slaves of the temple, says Dr. Clarke, who were the descendants of the *Gibeonites*, condemned to that condition by Joshua. See 1 Chron. ix, 2. That the Jews made *bond slaves* of such of the Canaanites as they took in war, is shown 1st Chron. v, from the 18th to the 22d verse inclusive, where the history of a great battle is related, that took place between the Israelites and a people of old Canaan, called *Hongarites*, of whom they made 100,000 prisoners. These prisoners, says Clarke in his comment on the place, were made slaves of, and not slain in the war.

From 1 Kings ii, 39, 40, it appears that private citizens, of the city of David, had slaves of the black or negro race, who were Canaanites. The place reads as follows: "And it came to pass at the end of three years [in the time of king David], that two servants of [*one*] *Shimei* ran away [out of Judea]

unto *Achish*, son of *Macha*, king of Gath. And they told Shimei, saying, behold thy servants be in Gath. And Shimei arose and saddled his ass, and went to Gath, to Achish, to seek his servants from Gath."

That these two servants were of the negro race, is shown by their running away to Gath, as Gath was inhabited by *Philistines*, a branch of the house or race of Mezarim, a son of Ham, and founder of the first settlement of lower Egypt. These Philistines, it appears, had not as yet, though in the days of David, been cut off by the wars of the Jews. It was, therefore, *natural* for the two slaves of the wealthy Shimei to fly for protection to a people of their own color and nation. Had those servants been of the Hebrew blood and entitled to their freedom at the jubilee, which happened at the end of every six years, they never would have fled from their own people and country to a negro heathen people. If these servants of Shimei had not been slaves, in the property sense of the word, but merely hired men, as abolitionists contend all servants were, then were they free men, and had no need of running away out of the country from their owner; neither could Shimei have demanded and took them away from Gath, as he did, had they not been slaves, for at this time there was no war between the Jews and the people of Gath. They were, therefore, slaves and of the race of Ham, in the proper sense of the word.

There is no subject upon which the Scriptures have spoken that is more circumstantial and plain than that of individual slavery, in relation to the descendants of the blood of Ham. First of all, and

more than four hundred years before the giving of the law by Moses, at the very time when God made a covenant with Abraham respecting the promised Messiah, the sign of which was circumcision, we find the buying of slaves, even by Abraham, incidentally alluded to. See Gen. xvii, 13, 23, as follows: "He that is born in thy house, and he that is *bought* with *money*, must needs be circumcised; and Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were *bought* with his *money*, every male among the men of Abraham's house [slaves and all], and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin, in the self same day, as God had said to him."

In Exodus xii, 44, the buying of slaves is also incidentally mentioned as follows: "But every man servant that is bought for *money*, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof," that is, of the passover. But that such servants as were bought with money, as above spoken of, were *not* so many hired men, as abolitionists seem to believe, appears from the next verse, the 45th, following the above quotation, which reads thus: "A foreigner, and a *hired* servant, shall not eat thereof."

From this statement it is clear, therefore, that a bond slave was not considered as a hired man. Is not this decisive respecting the difference between the two characters?

At the time when God made this covenant with Abraham, he was dwelling at a place called *Bethel* (Gen. xiii, 3), which was in the very midst of the Canaanite country: of whom, therefore, could he

have bought his bondmen, except of the black people of Canaan, who at that time possessed the country, as the original inhabitants. It is likely, also, that many of his slaves were brought with him from Egypt, on his return from that country, to which he and Lot had fled some years before, on account of a great famine in the country of Canaan (Gen. x, 12), as at the time he was rich in silver, gold, cattle and slaves.

In these countries, Egypt and Canaan, there were at *this* time no other people but the aboriginal negroes; the people, afterward known as Ishmaelites, or Arabs, did not then exist, nor had the white nations of men penetrated those countries from the north, where they first settled after the flood. The servants or slaves of Abraham, therefore, were of the negro race, and them only.

Abraham was not ignorant of the fiat of Noah, in relation to that people, nor of their naturally low cast of mind: on which account he felt for them, and bought as many as he could out of pity, as under *his* protection they were much more happy than in a state of freedom.

From Gen. xxvi, 13, 14, we learn that Isaac, the son of Abraham, had a vast host of slaves at the time he dwelt in *Gerah*, among the Philistines, who were, as before said, a branch of the family of Egypt. The account is as follows: "And the man [Isaac] waxed great, and went forward and grew until he became very great; for he had possessions of flocks, and possessions of herds, and great *store* of *servants*, and the Philistines envied him." In *this* trait of the

patriarchal history, respecting their wealth, it seems that their *slave* property is mentioned, and mixed up with the inventory, the same as is the account of flocks and herds, making no difference between them.

From the reasoning of Adam Clarke on the meaning of the word *servant*, it appears that the term *slave* is the *highest* possible idea the word conveys, while the word servant is but a secondary, an accommodated, or lower application and meaning of the term. See his comment on the 1st chapter of the Romans, page 36, where he insists that to be the *servant* of Jesus Christ was, as St. Paul has said, to be his *slave* or *property*, and that he had no *right* to himself, or any of the *powers* of soul or body—all belonging to his master, Jesus Christ.

This, therefore, establishes that the term, *bond servant*, as used every where in the Bible, signifies a *bond slave*, and not a *hired* servant, or a servant of any other kind, but slave in the true *property* sense of the word. And who is the man who can gainsay the criticisms of Dr. Adam Clarke on the ancient languages, especially the Hebrew and Greek? Slavery, and the possession of slaves, in all Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian history, as given in the Bible, was as popular as was the possession of property of any other kind.

That the *great store* of servants possessed by *Isaac*, the son of Abraham, when he lived in Gerar, among the *Philistines* (south toward Egypt and not a great way from the place where, in after ages, the temple was built), were slaves of the negro race, is shown from the fact, that the people of Canaan, Egypt. Philistia.

&c., were blacks at that time. The servants or slaves, therefore, which Isaac had, must have been of that race. At that time there were no *Ishmaelites*, no *Edomites*, no *Moabites*, no *Ammonites*—no descendants of *Abraham*, *Lot*, *Jacob* or *Esau*, of any account; all these families, at the time of Jacob's flourishing, were but young, like himself, and, of necessity, were at that time but few in number; even in his own family there were but *two sons*, Jacob and Esau. From *this* it follows, therefore, that the *slaves* he had were somehow procured from among the people where he sojourned and got his great wealth. *This*, to the writer, appears as absolute demonstration.

Of the same race were the servants who were given to Abraham by king Abimelech, of Gerar, long before the birth of Isaac. See Gen. xx, 14, where there is an account of the great fear that king fell into on account of his love to Sarai, Abraham's wife. But God showed him, in a dream, that he must not touch her, or himself, with all his house, should die. Now, when Abimelech had seen God in this dream, and had been directed what to do, it is written, in the chapter above quoted, that he made great presents to Abraham of sheep, oxen, *men* and *women* servants, besides a thousand pieces of silver.

Now, if the servants who were given by Abimelech to Abraham, together with the sheep and oxen, were not *property slaves*, how could he have done it; or how could the righteous man, Abraham, have received them, and thus take away their liberty, if they had any, except he considered it right to enslave

them? But Abimelech did thus give them, together with the herds, and Abraham did thus receive them.

Had these servants, thus transferred, no relation to leave, no affinities of kindred, from whom they were parted by the inexorable Abimelech and Abraham, in whose ears the loud and heart-rending cries of sons, grandmothers and babes, sounded as sweet music? No doubt but they had; just as much as is often the case among the negro families of the south, in America and elsewhere, when they are sold or transferred; and yet Abraham took them—that righteous man of God and a holy prophet. What would the abolitionists have said, if they had been there? Oh, ye powers, how they would have spouted forth words of mighty eloquence, stamped with their feet and banged about with their fists, looked red in the face, stretched up their length in altitude, frowned, grinned and shook their heads, as they do now-a-days, when holding forth abolitionism—and particularly when paid for it by the year, some six or eight hundred dollars.

Respecting the servants of Abraham, especially those that were bought with his money, they were of the same race; for the same reason as above, there being no other people at the *time* in old Canaan but the blacks of the country, for Abraham was a foreigner, a Chaldean from beyond the Euphrates, east. But after the lapse of some four or five hundred years, going down to the time of Moses, and the wars of Canaan, then these descendants of the blood of Abraham, *besides* the Jews, had become innumerable.

Abolitionists, in order to make sport of the opinion,

that the Jews, when they had got possession of Canaan, made slaves of the people instead of hiring them, ask, with a leer, *how* they did it. They wish to know if they took an armed band, with ropes and shackles, so as to tie them when they were caught, and thus compel them to slavery.

But of this query there is no need; for *Moses*, long before they had possession of Canaan, pointed out *how* this was to be done, especially in times of *peace*, for the Jews were not *always* at war with the Canaanites. See Levit. xxv, 45, where the mode of getting slaves is alluded to, as follows: "Moreover, of the *children* of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of *them* shall ye *buy*, and of their *families* that are with you, which they begat [or may beget] in your land, and *they* shall be your possession."

Here the difficulty vanishes, and with it the imagined armed band, ropes and shackles of abolitionism, as there could be no need of tying *children*, whom they might buy of such Canaanitish families as would be willing to sell them. It is well known that the negroes of *all* ages have been in the practice of selling their own *children*, when pressed by want, as they now do nearly all over Africa—who also enslave myriads of their *own* people by force, as we shall show in the course of the work.

As to the race inland in Canaan, they were *never* entirely exterminated by the Jews, as there were always remnants of tribes left in the land, who continued during the whole Jewish history, from Moses until they were destroyed by the Romans—a lapse of more than fifteen hundred years. There was always,

therefore, abundant opportunity for the Jews to purchase *children* of the people of that cast for slaves, as Moses had told them in the law should be their privilege.

Having, as proposed in the commencement of this section, shown that the law of Moses did *indorse* and *sanction* the enslaving of the race of Ham, as *denounced* by Noah, and that the Hebrews, through the whole Jewish history, acted toward them on *that* principle, we pass to *other* matters respecting the race. ONE of those matters will consist of an inquiry, whether God *created* the race of Ham, equal with the descendants of the other sons of Noah, in point of native intellectuality, and especially, with those of JAPHETH, the white race.

From Noah's lips went forth the dire account,
Which echoed on the top of Sinai's mount
That God *judicially* decreed by name
The race of *Ham* for slaves—th' lambent flame,
Gave out a voice, all holy—not a flaw,
And there *indorsed* the same in *Hebrew* law.
Now let no erring man deride the stroke,
For *judgment* is God's *strange* and fearful work.

[*Isaiah* xxviii, 26.

SEVENTH SECTION.

Arguments and positions of abolitionists favoring a belief that the Scriptures recognize the negro man as being equal with the other races, in point of blood and otherwise, refuted—Mark of Cain—What it was—No black men or negroes before the flood except one—Difference between the secreting power of the blood of white and negro men—Evidences that the Supreme Being puts a higher estimate on white than on black, as colors or complexions—Consent to this difference by the blacks themselves, though incidentally given, according to the accounts of travelers in Africa—A curious argument of abolitionists in favor of negro equality replied to, with many other interesting matters.

In this division of the work we shall examine a passage of Scripture, upon which abolitionists build their theory of the negro's natural and mental equality with white men. This passage of Holy Writ, upon which hangs the claimed excellence of that race, is written in the book of Acts xvii, 26, as follows: "*God hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times afore appointed, and the bounds of their habitations.*"

The arguments drawn from the Scripture by abolitionists, run *thus:*

In the veins of Adam, the first man and great father of all mankind, the blood of the negro race, as well as the blood of the other races, flowed free and full, on which account his equality with all other people is clearly made out, as they believe.

But to this opinion, we reply that there was never any negro blood in the veins of Adam, nor blood which produced the black or African race, naturally; whoever believes there was, will find it necessary to prove, that there were black men in the very family of Adam, and that they continued on down the course of time, as part and parcel of the antediluvian population, till the flood; which it is not possible to prove.

Should we allow that Cain's *mark* which was set upon him by the Divine power, was that of a black skin, this would not prove that it was derived from Adam's veins, but from a *curse* rather.

The mark, however, as held by the Jews, was not any affection of the skin of Cain, but an affection of the *nerves*, by which means he became a *paralytic*, or *trembler;* hence he was called *Nod*, the vagabond or the trembler, which also gave the same name to the country whither he fled, from the face of his father's family. If that mark *was* a black skin, yet this could not affect the children of Cain, unless, together with that mark, his *nature* and constitution was also changed, so that his race could partake with him of that curse. But were we to allow this, so as to make out the being of negroes before the flood, yet they could not be the progenitors of the *present* negroes of the earth, as all Cain's race, with all the other races were lost in the flood. On this account, we are the more confirmed in the belief, that the first negro of the earth was *Ham*, a son of Noah, and that Cain and his people, were no more negroes or black men than Adam was.

If then, the blood of Adam did not produce a *vari-*

egated multitude of human beings in relation to their complexions, differing as widely from each other as do black and white, then the blood of the *white* and the *black* man, did not flow in the veins of Adam, *as such*, or in this variegated condition, so as to produce by *natural* generation, *black*, *white*, and *red*, with all the hues of the human race intermixedly, like cattle or the fowls of the air.

Adam's blood, as the text reads, was but *one* blood only, not *many* bloods. This *one* blood could produce of itself, naturally, but *one* general character of human beings; this we think, is an incontrovertible position, proved true in the experience of all ages, by the progenies of the different races which now exist.

This was certainly the opinion of St. Luke, who was a *physician*, and of course a learned man—a philosopher, who wrote the famous passage above alluded to, as well as the whole book in which that passage is found; for he calls the blood of Adam in that scripture, *one* blood and no more.

Of this *one* blood God made the two *other* bloods, as we have shown on the first pages of this work. Into these two *new* bloods, God infused, or created, two *secreting* principles; *one* depositing between the *outer* and secondary skin of the body of one of these men a *white mucus*, causing the skin of that man to be *white*, and between the outer and inner skin of the other a *black mucus*, causing that man to be *black*.

That such is the fact *now*, is well known to physiologists, who admit that these mucuses cause the difference in the colors of all the human complexions. Did all these mucuses float between the inner and

outward skin of Adam? If so, then he was a very *mottled* looking object indeed, being red, black, and white, confusedly mixed together.

The creation, or infusing of this secreting principle into the blood of Japheth and Ham was *miraculous*, and no more difficult for the performance of the Divine hand than was the creation of the *mucus*, which gave the red color to Adam's skin at first.

That a *variety* of nations has been made out of that *one first* blood, is the very thing the writer, St. Luke, means, when he says, that God made of *one* blood *all* nations, &c. He does not say that *all* nations, *all* colors and kinds of people existed primarily in that first blood of Adam, but that out of, or *from*, that blood the other bloods have been produced.

From *that* scripture, therefore, as we deem, the equality of the negro race with the white race is not made out; as the *color*, *formation*, *woolly* hair, thick *skull*, pointed *posteriors*, *large* foot, pouting *lips*, wide and *flatted* nose, *low* forehead, hollow and compressed temples, *narrow* monkey shaped waist, *wide* chest, angular shaped legs, were not, and could not have been, the direct and *natural* propagation of Adam's blood.

But, says one, if it was *God* who made this change in the blood of Adam, when he formed those two sons, Japheth and Ham, so that, contrary to nature, Noah and his wife became the parents of two races of men entirely diverse from themselves, how is it that the negro man is not equally honorable with the white man, seeing it was God who was the author of this *curious* miracle?

It is made out that he is not equal, not only from the everywhere staring fact of the actual difference there is between the white and black races, but also from the ability of the Creator to make of *one* blood as many nations of men as he would, some to honor, and some to dishonor, exercising his power arbitrarily, as does the potter over the *same lump* of clay: Romans ix, 20, 21.

Thus has God seen fit to do in the creation of the two races of men, the negroes and the whites; one is degraded by *natural* tendencies, with a *curse* or a judicial decree to announce it, and the other with a blessing, equally judicial, both being dictated by the Holy Ghost from the lips of Noah.

As to the intrinsic superiority of a white complexion over that of black, there is no question; for, by the common consent of all ages among men, and even of God himself in heaven, there has been bestowed on white the most honorable distinction. WHITE has become the emblem of *moral* purity and truth, not only on earth, but in eternity also, as it is said of the saints, that they shall walk with the Lamb in *white*, not in *black* (Rev. iii, 4, 5), and be clothed in *white* raiment. When Christ, the Lamb that was slain, appeared to John, the beloved disciple, on the isle of Patmos, it was in the splendor of white. See Rev. i, 14: "His head and his hairs were *white* like wool, as white as *snow*." The same is said by Daniel, to whom this same glorious being appeared, some five hundred years before his appearance to St. John. See book of Daniel, chap. vii, 9, as follows: "I beheld till the thrones [of earth] were cast down, and the Ancient of

days [God Almighty] did sit, whose garment was *white* as *snow*, and the hair of his head like the *pure* wool," being excessively white. In this same character, as to appearance, he was seen on the top of a high mountain when transfigured, as stated by Matthew, chap. xvii, 2, where it is said, that his face shone as the sun, and that his raiment was as *white* as the light. In Rev. xx, 11, the very throne of God in heaven is said to be white, as follows: "And I saw a great *white throne*, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven [firmament] fled away."

The Savior of mankind, though born of a Jewish copper colored woman, was nevertheless a white man. This complexion, which characterized the body of God incarnate, was such as pleased him, or he would not thus have appeared. The proof that he was a white man, is derived from a letter, written by a Roman Senator from Judea, in the time of Augustus Cæsar, to Rome. In that letter, which is now extant, the man Jesus Christ is said to have been a man of surpassing beauty, having a bright fair complexion, with hair of the color of a ripe *filbert*, which is inclining to the yellow or golden color. His eyes were of the hazel or blue cast; his forehead high, smooth, and broad. His stature tall and exceedingly graceful, every motion and attitude bore the stamp of perfection, over all of which there was an indescribable sweetness, as well as of resistless command.

If the hair of his head was light colored, and his eyes of a blueish hazel, then he must have been of a

white complexion, as no copper colored Jew, Arab, or Indian, ever have such hair, or such eyes.

This being true, it adds another proof that, in the estimation of the Creator, the white complexion, such as is possessed by the race of Japheth, is more valuable than black or red, or the Son of God would not have chosen a body thus complexioned to make his appearance as the second Adam, or the Lord from Heaven.

Are not these instances sufficient to establish the point, that white has obtained the most honorable distinction, both in heaven and on earth, over that of black. Could this be so, were there not *intrinsically* something more valuable and pleasing to the Divine Being, in the fulgence of *whiteness*, than is in its opposite, which is black.

WHITE is the sign of life and being; for, previous to the existence of all *created* things over the whole face, as well as throughout the whole space of boundless, shoreless, fathomless, interminable eternity, there was relatively nothing but one ocean of the blackness of darkness. LIGHT, which is *white*, was therefore the first sign of created being, and is a fit similitude of the uncreated God, of whom it is said that God is *light*. John i, 5.

BLACK, in all ages, has been the *sign* of every hateful thing. If a man is uncommonly wicked, he is said to be a *black* hearted wretch, as a traitor, a liar, a thief, a murderer, &c. Sackcloth of hair, so often alluded to in the Scriptures, was a cloth that was black, and was referred to as the sign of mourning, judgment, and death. HELL, itself, which is situated

somewhere in the vast womb of eternal night, outside, and beyond the whole universe of God, so far off from the pale of creation, and the space occupied *now* by the great family of suns and worlds, which may yet be taken up by succeeding creations to all eternity, is spoken of as being "*the blackness of darkness;*" Jude 13. In second Peter, the same place, *hell*, is again referred to as being a *place* of *darkness*, where the angels, who kept not their *first* estate, are bound in chains (or depths) of darkness, and are reserved to judgment.

To the opinion of the superiority of *white* over black, the negroes themselves subscribe in the fact of their always and every where insisting that they ought to be called *colored* people, and not a black people, as they esteem it extremely degrading to be called *negroes*, or black people.

But, says one, this kind of involuntary confession of the blacks, respecting the disagreeableness of their color, arises out of their being in countries where all power, influence, wealth, rule, government, &c., are in the hands of the whites; but turn the tables, and step over to Africa, if you please, where you will find the negro man in his native glory, walking abroad in his primeval independence, having not a dream in the visions of his soul that a black skin is not a handsome and becoming complexion. We will step over to Africa, as the thing is easily done, and see whether it is really so, by making inquiries of travelers, who have made themselves familiar with their manners and customs, their loves and antipathies.

As being pertinent to this subject, we shall make a

few extracts from Damberger's Travels in Africa. This man is a good witness, as he was many years in the interior of that country, having ran away from a Dutch military garrison, at the Cape of Good Hope, and fled into the interior, hiding himself among the Caffres. of whom he learned the language of the negro nations.

From thence, after a long time, he traveled by piece meal, alone, and always nearly naked, the whole length of Africa, full four thousand miles, commencing at the Cape, and coming out at Morocco, near *Santa Cruz*, being sixteen years in performing the journey, passing over sixty degrees of the globe, keeping along on the western side of the continent, at no great distance from the sea. This journey of Damberger was commenced in 1781, over sixty years ago, and ended in 1797. This work may be seen in the State Library at Albany, New York.

During this journey, Damberger fell in with a tribe, or nation, by themselves, called *Mattamans*, with whose chief he remained some days to rest. This negro king was a powerful man as to bone and muscle, but went about entirely naked, as did all his people, except a slender covering of the waist. A little distance from the residence of this chief, there was a son of his, whither Damberger was desired to accompany the king on a visit. This son had two little daughters, one about nine, and the other seven years old, who, on beholding the white man as he drew near with their grandfather, came running to meet them. But instead of remaining to be carressed by their grandfather, they immediately left him,

and clung to the white man, though a stranger, leaping and playing about, and crying out with great glee and satisfaction, "*Yo no colo, yo no colo!*" that is, pretty *white* man, pretty *white* man. See *Damberger's Travels, vol.* i, p. 175. p.188

This was the voice of nature speaking with the tongues of these children, in approval of the white man's complexion over their own, the same as they would have done on finding a pretty flower, a tree laden with berries, or any thing that was pleasing to their sight.

The same kind of preference of many of the tribes, among whom he wandered, was shown to Damberger, as well by the men as the women, who would gather round him, calling him handsome because he was *white*. Some would, in the most unreserved manner, lift his garments which he wore about his waist, and examine the sign of his sex with cries of approval, desiring a union of his blood with theirs. Vol. i, p. 99, 128.

By one of the tribes this man fell in with, who were called *Kinonians*, he was scrutinized more closely than common, in relation to the idea above alluded to, and being highly approved of, on account of his great beauty and *whiteness* of complexion, they were strongly minded to detain him against his will, for the improvement of their race by amalgamation. On this account he made his escape by stealth, being assisted by a young negress of the tribe. Vol. ii, p. 103.

Thus Damberger was received wherever he went among the black nations of Africa. To the eye of

civilization, this poor runaway from the garrison of the Cape must have been a frightful looking being, as he was nearly naked, his skin sunburnt and scaly. His hair and beard grown to a most hideous length, poor and emaciated in person, and yet with all these disadvantages, the negroes, men and women, and even the children, were delighted with his beauty.

When, for the first time, a child of the white race sees a negro man, it is always frightened by the horible apparition. Even to a man, or any person of adult years, the first sight of a black human being, gives them a shock, or a feeling of the most singular character, mixed up of pity, disgust and wonder, not experienced by negroes, on seeing a white human be ing for the first time.

This admiration of the blacks, bestowed upon the white nations and individuals, is the involuntary voice and approval of nature, which speaks always the truth, far enough removed from the influence of circumstances.

When the famous traveler, *Mungo Park*, was in Africa, and having occasion to ascertain, in a certain place, the altitude of the sun, it was noticed that a powerful young negro man, as to size, a prince, as they said he was, but naked, paid very close attention to the arrangement of the instrument, the quadrant in particular, and saw that they were doing something about the *sun*, when he cried out in evident distress of mind, "*black man nothing*." Lawrence's Lectures, p. 420.

Here, probably for the first time in his life, a thought respecting his race being black and degraded,

arose in his mind, occasioned by a comparison of himself and people with the white men then before him, who appeared able even to measure that flaming globe of seeming fire, the sun, which had glared for ages along the highway of the heavens, and the thought alarmed him; so that in his native tongue he exclaimed, "black man nothing."

Another evidence in support of the belief, that a white skin is preferred by the negro race, is afforded in the fact that, among the kings and petty chiefs of the Africans, a female who may chance not to be as black as common, is more highly prized as a beauty, and considered an acquisition of immense importance. In every part of the world, it is a matter of boasting with negro men and women, if they can show that they have *white* blood mixed with theirs; or if they can get themselves united in consanguinity with the white race; this is the same also among the Indians. It is a very rare thing, if it ever happens at all, for a negro man or woman to boast of the purity of their African blood, or of the intensity of the blackness of their bodies, or woolliness of their hair, while the contrary is the fact, as they are rejoiced at any departure in their progeny from the baleful hue, whether among white nations or in the wilds of Africa. Were it not for *this* trait in the character of their being, namely, their dissatisfaction with their formation and complexion, there would be still greater reason to judge them as wanting in natural intellectuality.

There is another position which the pleaders of negro equality and excellence urge with great impet-

nosity, from which they infer that the God of the human race never intended their enslavement. This position arises out of the circumstance of the Creator having given to man in Adam, the control, rule and government, over all the animal creation, in their subjugation; making thereby all nations and all races of men lords *alike* in this particular, as is seen to have been the case, Gen. i, 26, and ix, 2. The *first* was said when God was about to make man, as in the first quotation. The second was said, as in the last quotation, after the flood, to Noah and his family.

As to the amount of the *first* scripture, it can have no application to the negro's case at all, in making them lords in that particular, equal with white men, over the animals of the earth, as during all the ages of the antediluvian world, there was not a negro on the earth, except Ham, the son of Noah.

As to the amount of the second scripture, in relation to the negro race, we do not in the least deny their equal lordship with white men, over all the animals of the globe; but we deny that their equality can be made out of premises so small. Because God has given to the race of Ham *some* equal privilege with the race of Japheth, is he, therefore, in *all* respects his equal? Though the negro race have an equal right to the elements of nature, as have *all* animals, yet this cannot, and does not, elevate the standard of their capacities.

The same God who gave to man, both black and white alike, the equal natural lordship of animals, has also, of his own good pleasure, placed the negro

race within the control of his superior, which is as certainly said in so many words, by Noah, as that it is said that God in the beginning made the heavens and the earth.

The position is too *far* fetched, too *circuitous* and winding, to bear the straight forward light of truth, as all experience and observation in all ages, prove their inequality and mental inferiority with white men, even themselves being judges, as they never have claimed so high a standing as a people, that we are aware of.

Having thus passed through the inquiry, respecting the original equality of the negro race with the rest of mankind, as claimed for them by abolitionists, on the ground of the one *blood* argument, derived from the book of Acts, and the fact of the negro's equal lordship over animals, we pass to an examination, in some degree, of their general, as well as particular and personal character, during which it will more and more appear, that they are *not*, have *never* been, and can *never* be, the equals of white men in almost all the mental powers and capacities of human nature, and that they were thus produced by the Divine hand.

As o'er their limbs a cloud of darkness lowers,
So hangs a mental gloom upon their powers:
The ray Divine gives not so fair a flame,
Nor shows as much the glory of God's name,
As on the white man's brow, his soul, his face,
Is seen to shine—so pleased creative grace—
Yet who is he that boasts, for can the clay
Have glorying thoughts or proud words to say?

EIGHTH SECTION.

Moral and civil character of the negro race—Acts of the negro Sodomites—Their lewdness, &c.—Proofs from many authors respecting their amours with dumb beasts—As well from the Scriptures—Of this the Canaanites were guilty—As well as the Egyptians—Moses's testimony to this—Herodotus's testimony from his own observations when in Egypt—*Gales's* testimony—*Sonnini's* testimony—Testimony of the Prophet Ezekiel—Curious sexual formation of the negro race—Lewd customs of the ancient Egyptians about their temples, as seen by Herodotus—Same traits of character among the negroes of all countries at the present time, in America, and every where—Dreadful practices of the *women* of Egypt—Writer's apology for plain writing on matters of this description—Proofs that Jezebel and all her priests were black, with some account of her character as a negress and a wanton—Account of automaton images made for lewd purposes by the women of those times—Pictures and images of the Canaanites—Influence of these doings of the negroes of those ages on the Hebrews—Curious reason of the Jewish Rabbi why the dogs would not eat the head and hands of Jezebel—Horrid customs of the African negroes—Respecting the marriages of their young women, as related by Herodotus—Corresponding character of the Africans *now* in these particulars, as related by travelers—Rollin's testimony to the same thing.

As a justification of the severity of God against the race of Ham, we shall now give some account of their character, who, as will appear, are, and have always been, the faithful disciples, and imitators of their lascivious and degraded father. It is not to be doubted that Ham, notwithstanding the goodness of his two brothers, Shem, and Japheth, and his right-

eous patriarch father, was as wicked as any of the antediluvians, who were destroyed in the flood. But for the sake of the Divine Providence, carrying into effect his plan of inhabiting the hot regions of the earth, after the flood, with a suitable race of men, who, in their constitutions and animal appetites, should be fitted to the climate, &c., as before argued, this progenitor of all the Africans was taken in and preserved in the Ark, with the rest of Noah's family.

A vivid, as well as a frightful trait of the character of this whole people, the races of Mezarim, Cush, Phut, and Canaan, the four sons of Ham, is shown in the actions of the Sodomites, in the days of Lot, the half brother of Abraham.

The Sodomites were the same people with the Canaanites, living along the great vale of the river Jordan, which bounded the land of Canaan on the east toward Syria. The occasion on which their peculiar character and general behavior was manifested, is familiar to every reader of the Scriptures; see Gen. xix, written by the hand of Moses, in substance as follows:

On a certain day, as the sun was going down, there came toward the city of Sodom two young men, who, as Josephus says, were very beautiful and tall. They appeared as if weary, but manifested no inclination to enter the gates of the place, or any house wherein to rest. But LOT, who lived there, happening just then to be reclining on a seat at the gate, which was near to his dwelling within, saw the strangers, and immediately rising up, invited them to accompany him to his house, and to tarry

with him till morning, of which they accepted, though apparently in a reluctant manner.

Now as soon as it was dark, the men of that part of the city assailed the dwelling of Lot, demanding that the two strangers should be brought out into the street, that they might "*know* them," as they said. This peculiar term to "*know them*," was fraught with a meaning, of which hell and all its inhabitants would have been ashamed, had they heard it. To the demand however, Lot objected with great vehemence, saying, "I pray you, do not so wickedly."

On hearing this, they became enraged at Lot, when they said they would deal worse with him than with the strangers, because he had, as they pretended, set himself up as a *judge* among them. Here they made a rush, crying out, *stand back*, intending to seize Lot, and to drag him into the street, where they meant to abuse him, in the same way they intended to abuse the two young men.

But on the instant when their rage had gone up in the scale of fury to its highest altitude, and when their fingers were nerved with the deep energies of satanic violence, ready to grasp their victims, the two young men, the strangers who stood just within, put forth their hands, and pulled Lot into the house, when they shut the door. But as the Sodomites pressed on, to break down the door of Lot's house, behold they were shrouded in a deep, thick darkness, so that they groped about miserably, not knowing where they were, or what they should do, for they had been struck in the midst of their fury, by an invisible power, with blindness.

In this horrid condition they spent the night, seeing nothing till morning, when their eyes were opened, and they saw the heavens teeming with glaring meteors of flame, which chased each other, as in sport, while others seemed to stand still, looking down on the devoted region below, as if they were endowed with thoughts, and were watching the progress of Lot's escape to the mountains, beyond the plain.

When this was accomplished, and Lot and his family were safe, then began the work of wrath, as if the lightnings of the elements from the four winds of heaven kept holyday, and yet were obedient to the beck of an awful hand, which far up in the gloomy concave was seen in flaming red, pointing them to their courses. Then fell a tempest of fire, mingled with burning brimstone, from the Lord, out of Heaven, destroying not only the great vale of Sodom, but five cities, with hamlets and villages innumerable. So violent and fierce was the fire, that it devoured the very ground in all that region, as it was composed much of a bituminous strata, to a great depth, in which the Jordan flowed and formed the Dead Sea.

Thus disappeared, at one buffet of the Almighty hand, many ten thousands of the lewd race of Ham, in a way the most horrible to think of. There must have been some extraordinary reason for severity so amazing, as it was far more dreadful in its *application*, than either the curse of Noah, the exterminating decree against the Canaanites in the law of Moses, or their doom to perpetual slavery.

LEWDNESS, of the most hideous description, was the crime of which they were guilty, blended with idolatry in their adoration of the gods, who were carved out of wood, painted, and otherwise made, so as to represent the wild passions of lascivious desires, in both male and female forms. This was the character of all the Hamethian race in old Canaan, Egypt, and every where, but more especially in Sodom, who seem to have outdone all competitors, for they gave themselves entirely over, without the least reserve, even going after "*strange flesh*," which signified dumb beasts [see St. Jude, verse 7], as well as man after man.

For many particulars of the practices of the negro nations of these ages, see xviiith and xxth chapters of Leviticus, where it is shown that they outraged all order and decency of human society, making no difference between sisters, mothers, neighbors, wives, men, and animals, in their amours and sexual commerce.

Should the reader desire to know the truth on this subject, he will do well to examine the Scriptures above alluded to, where the crimes of these nations are set down in horrible array. To show this, we will make a brief quotation from the xviiith of Leviticus, 22–24, as follows: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination. Neither shalt thou lie with any *beast*, to defile thyself therewith; neither shall any *woman* stand before a beast, to lie down thereto: it is confusion. Defile not yourselves in any of these things: for in *all* these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you."

Now, what nations did God cast out of Canaan? The answer is, he cast out seven mighty negro nations, who were more powerful, and greater in numbers, than were the Jews, *all* of whom, as said by Moses, were guilty of *all* the appalling deeds, set down in order in the two chapters above referred to. That such practices did prevail among the people of Ham, is stated not only by Moses, in *his* time, but *Herodotus*, the most ancient of the Greek historians, says the same thing respecting the negroes of *his* age. The statements of this author are to be relied on, says Adam Clarke, in his commentary on one of the same chapters we have referred the reader to as above, namely, the xxth of Leviticus, verse 16.

Herodotus says that he saw, when he was in Egypt, with his own eyes, an Egyptian woman accompanying with a he-goat, in the very streets of the city she lived in. The time when Herodotus traveled in Egypt and other parts of Africa, was some 450 years B. C., and more than a thousand from the time of Moses, which proves the incurable proneness of that people, the negro race, to the most extraordinary and shameful abuses of human nature.

Dr. Clarke says, in his comment on Exod. xxii, 19, that it is certain, from an account in *Sonnini's* travels in Egypt, that lying with dumb beasts is practiced even now, as well as in the time of Moses. The *goat*, in the New Testament, see Math. xxv, 33, is used as the symbol of all sinners. On this symbol, says Clarke, "the goat is naturally quarrelsome, *lascivious*, and excessively ill-scented, and was considered a fit symbol of all riotous, profane, and impure

men." How very *similar*, according to the above, were these two characters, the *goat* and the *negro*? They were alike in passions, in propensities, and in their *smell*, both disagreeable to excess.

GALE, the traveler, says the same thing of the Egyptians; who gives a description of a case of the kind, which he saw transacted between a he-goat and an Egyptian woman. Bochart gives many examples of this character in his work. Says Adam Clarke, vol. ii, Coll. 641: Moses, Joshua, and the Jews, have been accused of excessive cruelty, while prosecuting their wars against the Canaanites, in the destruction of not only men, but helpless women and children. But let such persons as are offended on account of the rigor of the Jews against the Canaanites, become acquainted with the true character of those nations, as well the women as the men, and they will not hesitate to justify God, who commanded their entire extermination, and those who execute those commands.

Were there a district of country within the pale of Christendom, inhabited by blacks, or any other people, who were guilty of such things as Moses, Herodotus, Gale, Bochart, and many others say they were, there would be an immediate rush of mankind, of all orders, infidel and Christian, to cut them off, and to obliterate every vestige of a people, so polluted in their propensities and deeds, from the face of the earth.

The prophet Ezekiel's account of the negroes of Egypt and Canaan [chap. xvi, 26, 27], corroborates all that is said above, where he speaks of them as being "*great of flesh*," whose mischievous manners

had corrupted the women of the Jews to such a degree that many of them had made themselves images of men, in imitation of the Egyptian images, and committed fornication with them, literally.

The meaning of the words, "*great of flesh*," as used by the prophet Ezekiel, in reference to the Egyptian negroes, is said by an ancient writer, says Adam Clarke, in his comment on that place in Ezekiel, in Latin, "*Bene vasti longa mensura incognita nervi*," and applied strictly to the negro nations on that particular, as also it does at the present time.

In chapter xxiii of that prophet, 8, 20, 21, 27, it is stated that all the lewd abominations practiced by the Jews, in his time, which was about 600 years B. C., were brought from Egypt, and learned of the Egyptians, whose flesh, says Ezekiel (verse 20), was as the flesh of *asses*, and their *issue* as the issue of horses; so gross, fierce, and brutal were they, in their love of disorderly practices. But what do the Scriptures mean in the above phraseology, respecting the Egyptians, namely, that their *flesh* was as the *flesh* of *asses?* Simply as follows: that between the sexual members of the negro man and the brute called an ass, there was but little difference as to elongation and magnitude.

If the passage is not thus understood, then it will follow that the Egyptian negroes, and consequently the whole negro race, are not human; for the prophet plainly says, that their flesh was as the flesh of asses; and asses are not human. To allow them, therefore, a place among the species called man, we are compelled to admit that interpretation.

This very singular account respecting the peculiar formation of the black race, as given by that prophet, is corroborated by Herodotus, the Greek, who says, chapters xlviii and xlix, pages 85, 87, that the *images* of the sexual sign of the male of the human race, as carried about the streets of Egypt, in the precincts of their temples, on certain festival days, were generally a cubit in length. Now, the ancient cubit was from eighteen to twenty-one inches; and why this imitation was carried about on the days of their religious celebrations, Herodotus says he was not at liberty to relate.

This was said by Herodotus out of fear, perhaps, of the priests of those temples. Were we to venture an opinion respecting what he would have said, had he been at liberty, it would have been that they worshiped, by aid of that kind of image, the *procreative* principle, by which means all animal life is produced. The *instrument* of which, from analagous reasoning, according to Egyptian theology, might properly, therefore, be adored, a god well suited to the worship of Sodomites.

As it respects the crime of Ham, the youngest son of Noah, Gen. ix, 22–24, it is believed by some, and not without reason, that it did not consist alone in the seeing his father's nakedness, as a *man*, but rather in the abuse and actual *violation* of his own mother.

This opinion is strengthened by a passage found in Levit. xviii, 8, as follows: "The nakedness of thy father's *wife* shalt thou not uncover: it is thy *father's* nakedness." On account of *this* passage, it has been

believed that the crime of Ham did not consist alone of seeing his father in an improper manner, but rather of his own mother, the wife of Noah, and of violating her.

If this was so, how much more horrible, therefore, appears the character of Ham, and how much more deserving the *curse*, which was laid upon him and his race, of whom it was foreseen that *they* would be like *this*, their lewd ancestor.

All Egypt, the Sodomites, the Canaanite nations, with all the negro heathen countries, practiced these outrages upon good order (as stated by Moses, see Levit. xviii, 3, and chap. xx, 23), without shame or remorse, as if, indeed, they considered themselves as being no better than the cattle of the fields.

For these things, as foreseen, they were adjudged judicially, together with Ham, as an inferior race of men, and could never be elevated on account of their natures.

The baleful fire of unchaste amour rages through the negro's blood more fiercely than in the blood of any other people, inflaming their imaginations with corresponding images and ideas, on which account they are a people who are suspected of being but little acquainted with the virtue of chastity, and of regarding very little the marriage oath. In all the southern regions it is thus; promiscuous intercourse of the sexes every where prevails among the blacks. This state of things is attested to by abolitionists themselves, in relation to the negroes of the southern states.

For the *proof* of this, see "*The Bible against Slav*

ery," No. 6, 1838, page 63, in a *note*, as follows: "To the female character among the black population, we cannot allude but with feelings of the bitterest shame. A *similar* condition of moral pollution and *utter* disregard of a pure and virtuous reputation, is to be found *only* without the pale of Christendom." The same is said by the Rev. *James A. Thorne*, as recorded in the pamphlet above alluded to, in a note, page 3, and was part of a set speech, delivered in New York, May, 1834, as follows: "I would not have you fail to understand (says Mr. Thorne) that this is a *general* evil. What I now say, I say from deliberate conviction of its *truth*, that the *whole* states are *Sodoms*, and almost every family is a *brothel*. I refer to the inmates of the kitchens, *not* to the whites."

But all this is told and published to the world by abolitionists, with the view of having it understood that this awful and ruinous propensity of the negroes, as well as the practice, is wholly owing to the institutions of slavery. THIS, however, is not true; for they have been always thus. From the very days of Ham, their father, down through their whole history, whether in a civilized or savage state, whether in the wilds of Africa, the islands of the sea, whether enslaved or free, it was always so with them.

That *one* passion conquers all, and will conquer every *mortal* endeavor to elevate the race much above their present level. There is but one power that can help them, and this is the power which rescued the man of Capernaum from the dominion of an "*unclean devil*," Luke iv, 33, that alone can

change *this* trait of the black man's character. But although we admit, as in the above sentence, that there is a redeeming power, which, if sought unto by the negro man, can and will heal him of that infirmity; yet, as we are informed, this very sin infects even the sanctuary of religion in the south among the negroes.

For a proof of this, see a paper entitled the "*Colored American*," published in New York, by Charles Ray, No. 9, Spruce street. The date of the paper is March 7, 1840. This paper is devoted to abolition purposes, in which is the following account of the travels of a certain minister of the gospel, by the name of S. HOES, through the southern country. This man, on arriving at the city of New Orleans, visited, one evening, a negro religious meeting, over which a white preacher presided. The congregation consisted of some eight hundred colored persons. Many of them seemed to be intelligent in their appearance. Their decorum in the church, and attention to the sermon, was worthy of all imitation. They sung with great devotion and melody. Their piety, the minister said, was generally uniform and consistent, with but *one* exception. And what was that exception, think ye? it was *promiscuous* intercourse between the sexes, which the pastor said was their formidable sin, and of which they were guilty to an alarming degree, and was common throughout all that country, among the blacks.

In this fact is seen how powerful an influence lewdness exerts over the degraded and low-minded spirits of the African race, yielding themselves up to mere

sensuality and devilishness, to the exclusion of all true virtue and elevation of soul. In their *real* character, though reared up under the influence of the holy religion of Christ, we see, as in the case above named, no difference between them and the people of Egypt—lewdness being predominant in their characters, and an indifference to the regulations of virtuous principles.

We consider that such things committed by the members of *Christian* societies are, if possible, far worse than the same acts performed by the Egyptians, who were under the influence of a religion which favored and encouraged the gratification of sense in *this* particular. But it is all one; for it was the lewd propensities of that race of mankind, which moved their ancestors, in the days of *Ham* and *Nimrod*, to invent and institute the rites of paganism, which favored, and even insisted, that the gratification of that *one* passion was a cardinal virtue, and pleasing to the gods: wherefore, in both cases, whether under the supervision of the pagan or the Christian religion, the *character* of the race appears to be the same—their *nature* predominates, and that alone.

Herodotus says, that the women of Egypt would approach the images of the male character, of their own manufacturing, in the open streets, while multitudes were looking on, and capering to the sound of music, mixed with deep yells of revelry, while these rites of Bacchus were being accomplished. Were we to give a literal account of these images, and the automaton machinery by which the obscene shaped

god was made to imitate life and motion, it would not fail to offend; we therefore desist, fearing that we have already said too much; and yet the *truth* should not be hidden on matters of this description more than on others, and especially when the manners and religions of the ancients of mankind are concerned. In such cases, if timidity is allowed to conquer truth, how is truth to be known? Even the Scriptures do not hesitate to state facts of the worst description, relative to the negro race, and in language of the most honest character; we therefore feel that *duty*, in relation to the truth, respecting the aim of this work, must, and ought to prevail. Moreover, if a writer is not allowed plainly to state facts, in the best manner he can, on subjects of *this* kind, which relate to the history of the human race in the early times of the globe, and respecting the *religion* of those ages, how is *virtue* and *vice* to be contrasted? How is the religion of God incarnate to be exhibited, as being infinitely better in its influences upon our race, except by comparison and the exhibition of facts?

JEZEBEL, the worst woman ever heard of in the annals of mankind, the wife of *Ahab*, one of the kings of *Israel*, not of *Judea*, was a negro woman, the daughter of ETHBALL, king of Zidonia. The Zidonians were of the same race with the Tyrians, so often spoken of in the Scriptures as being the inhabitants of Tyre and Zidon. SIDONIUS was one of the sons of *Canaan*, who was the son of *Ham*, and, according to Josephus, built the city Sidonius, or Zidon, which was thus named after and in honor

of its founder. This city was adjacent to the kingdom of Israel, of which Ethball, the father of Jezebel, the wife of *Ahab*, was king, and proves Jezebel to have been a negress; because her father was a king of a negro people, descended from Ham by the lineage of Canaan, and Canaan's son, Sidonius.

That this Ethball, the father of Jezebel, was king of Sidon at the time Ahab was king of Israel, is shown from 1 Kings xvi, 31, which reads as follows: "And it came to pass, as if it had been a light thing for him [Ahab] to walk in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, that he took to wife *Jezebel*, the daughter of Ethball, king of Zidon, and went and served Baal, and worshiped him."

Baal was one of the gods of the negro Canaanites, but what his shape was is not known. Jezebel being a heathen of the worst description, and a woman of great impudence and boldness of character, as well as exceedingly beautiful, as a negress, captivated the vitiated imagination of Ahab by her wiles and fascinations, and became queen of the kingdom of Israel. Having achieved this, and united the house of her father with the renowned race of the Jews, she became anxious that her gods and religion should be honored by the king, her husband, and his people, thinking thereby to increase the glory of her father's house and kingdom, which had been shorn down, and eclipsed of its ancient extent and greatness by the wars and victories of the Jews during many hundred years, as well as to extend the fame of her lascivious and darling religion.

In order to accomplish this, she had temples built

with the consent of the king, her husband, in which were celebrated the intoxicating rites of prostitution by the ministry of a great multitude of pagan priests of her own country. As connected with the celebration of the rites of the Zidonian religion, she caused certain images to be manufactured in the form of *Priapuses*, which were fabled monsters, bred in the brains of an idolatrous priesthood, having the human shape from the waist upward; below the waist there was the form of a *bull*, or a *he-goat*—with other members—the shame of heathenism. By wiles of this description, she seduced Ahab the king, and with *him* vast multitudes of the subjects of his kingdom, the Israelites, to the worship of the Zidonian *Venus* sometimes called, in the Scriptures, Astarta.

She persuaded her husband to build a house, or a great temple, in a forest, where she had an image made of a standing tree, fashioned after the likeness above described—a priapus, as the Jewish Rabbi relate. This image was consecrated by her ministers as the tutelar divinity, or guardian of the woods and vineyards. That idol was like one that was made and worshiped by another woman of those times, who was of the same principles with Jezebel. This woman's name was MAACHA, who was the queen mother of ASA, one of the kings of Judah, who reigned but a little time before Ahab was king of Israel. She was doubtless an acquaintance of Jezebel, being an adult woman when Jezebel was but young, or before she was married to Ahab.

Respecting this image made by *Maacha*, the mother of *Asa*, RABBI SOLOMON, a Jewish commentator

on the writings of the Old Testament, says the idol or image of queen Maacha was a horrible statue, made in a state of entire nakedness, with the sign of the masculine sex of great proportions, which she admired daily, in the sight of all men, as a religious rite, like the Egyptian women, to her public shame, at which the people laughed and wondered. See 1 Kings xv, 11–13, on this subject, as follows: "And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, as did David. He took away the Sodomites out of the land, and removed all the idols his father had made. And he also removed *Maacha*, his mother, even *her* he removed from being queen, *because* she had made an idol in a grove; and Asa destroyed the idol, and burnt it by the brook Kidron."

Adam Clarke, in commenting on this passage, as above, says that the image spoken of there was a *Priapus*, a creature half man and half bull, or half he-goat, or some other dumb beast; and that it was worshiped with *lewd rites*, which agrees with the statements of Rabbi Solomon, in the essence of the thing, though the language of Clarke is not so bold on the subject as is the communication of Rabbi Solomon.

It is evident, from the Scriptures and ancient history, that the whole land of old Canaan, and the negro countries elsewhere, such a Egypt, Lybia, Ethiopia, and all Africa besides, were filled with the *signs*, *paintings*, and *pictures* of lewdness, as well as with sculptured and molten images, of both male and female human beings, and of monsters, half human and half animal, especially among the nations of Ca-

naan. By such means, the grosser passions of human nature were continually excited to disorder, violence, and confusion. Out of this influence arose all kinds of extravagant behavior, tending to the corruption of the manners of mankind.

That such *was* the fact in Canaan, is shown from Numbers xxxiii, 51, 52, where Moses is charged by the Divine power, as follows: "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them: When ye are passed over Jordan into the land of Canaan, *then* ye shall drive out *all* of the inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all their PICTURES, and all their *molten images*, and quite pluck down all their high places." From this scripture there can be no doubt but the images, as well as the pictures, there alluded to, were all of a piece; having been so fashioned as to exhibit sights of the most obscene description, placed in their houses by the way side, and even in their religious temples or houses of worship, presenting every where before the eyes of the people, male and female, young and old, the objects of their adoration and delight.

Such a state of things was entirely resistless in their influence, especially on the negro population, and but barely overcome by the severities and high inducements of a *spiritual*, and more refined, reasonable, and mental religion, which was that of the Jews. It was the impure and seducing rites, as well as the pictures and images of the pagan worship of all the negro countries in Africa, as well as the remnants of the Canaanitish tribes, who yet remained in the land of Judea, or old Palestine, which so often

misled the people of the twelve tribes from truth, and the right ways of the Hebrew religion. And although at the *time* we are now speaking of, it was over thirteen hundred years from the date of the curse of Noah, yet we find the abandoned race of Ham, holding on their way of wickedness, their original character, every where combating the virtuous and self-denying religion of Moses.

The negro nations of those ages, appear to have acted as bad as they could, and to have injured mankind in morals all that was possible, as if they were *indeed* revenging themselves on God, because of the curse of *Noah*, as Nimrod, the grand-son of *Ham*, threatened to do, because he drowned the world [as Josephus says, book 1, chap. iv, p. 19], and was particularly acted out, by Jezebel and her great multitude of negro priests and votaries, in the midst of the Jewish tribes.

But this Jezebel came finally to a fearful end; for when JEHU came to the throne of Israel, and immediately after the death of Ahab, he caused her to be cast headlong from the window of an upper room of the palace, out of which she but a moment before had looked, having *tired* her head and painted her face to disguise her negro complexion, and if possible thereby to seduce the new king, Jehu. But in this she failed. In that horrid fall, she was so bruised and broken, that she lay as one that was dead, when the furious Jehu rode over her with his war horse, stamping her down on the pavements, where she expired, wallowing in her own blood.

Immediately, as it had been foretold by Elijah, the

Prophet, fifteen years before [1 Kings xxi, 23], the dogs came and devoured her, all but her feet, the palms of her hands, and her head: see 2 Kings, ix, 35. On this subject, respecting the parts of her body which the dogs refused to eat, the Jewish Rabbi have made, says Adam Clarke, some very singular remarks, from which we gather a few particulars relative to the *private* character of this queen of prostitutes, as follows:

The reason [say these Jewish Rabbi] the dogs left the parts of her body spoken of above, was because, in her festal dances in the house of her gods, which was built in a grove, she used to get down on all fours, in imitation of a beast, and in this attitude would caper and leap about, being disrobed, while the multitude of her priests and the worshipers looked on. During such performances, she would move her head from one side to the other, in a gay and wanton manner, for a purpose not proper to describe. She was no doubt [says Adam Clarke] guilty of the *foulest* actions, almost too bad to be believed.

The temple of Baal, in the grove which Ahab built for his negro queen, was occupied by no less than four hundred and fifty priests, and the *temple*, another vast building, but not in the woods, was occupied by four hundred more—amounting in all to eight hundred and fifty lusty negro ministers, of the whorish religion of the Zidonians, the people of Jezebel. This great multitude of priestly dignitaries were all put to the sword, at the suggestion of the Prophet Elijah, under the authority of Ahab, as the law of Moses required respecting idolaters, at the time of the

noted debate on theology between Elijah and the Baalites, when God himself answered by *fire* to end the dispute. See 1 Kings xviii, 38.

That those priests of Baal were *black men*, is shown not only from their having been of the same people with Jezebel, but also from the appellation given them by the Jews, who called them in derision (*cemarim*, from *camar*), the *black* priests of Baal. See Clarke's comment on 2 Kings, xxiii, 5. That those priests of Baal, called by the Targums, *camar*, or the *black* priests, were not thus called on account of their wearing black vestments, as Dr. Clarke has supposed, but because they were actually of black complexions—as it is well known that in all ages among pagan nations of the old world, the priests officiating at their altars of sacrifice, were always dressed in *white*—in imitation, no doubt, of the priests of the *Hebrews*—which was a sign of *purity*, *dignity*, and *holiness*.

It follows, therefore, that the Jews called them black priests of Baal, because they were black, and for no other reason. In this chapter, just quoted, if the reader desire it, he can find the names of several of the negro gods of those ages, and also in 1 Kings xi, 5, 7, whose horrid worship infested the whole of mankind; as it was from *this* people a knowledge of idolatry was derived, to the whole Greek and Roman world, as well as in the most early times immediately after the flood, to the myriads of the Indies, and to the Jews and other nations of the earth.

Succoth Benoth, a Hebrew phrase, meaning tents of prostitutes, was the name of one of the negro

gods, long before the time of Christ, which name signified the "tabernacle of the daughters," or of the young virgins, at whose temple they were inducted into the rites and mysteries practiced in the worship of these obscenely formed images, by the prostitution of their persons.

HERODOTUS gives the following account of the Succoth-Benoth rites. Every young woman of the country, where the image was adored, was obliged, while yet a virgin, to visit the temple *once*, where she was to be humbled, by the first man who should chance to fancy her.

From these accounts it does appear, that the black nations of those ages, waged a universal and a perpetual war upon chastity, seeming to have been determined to expel from the face of the earth, all ideas of such a thing. To effect this, they bent all the powers of civil and religious influence against it, making the possession thereof a *crime*, to be punished with death, inasmuch as they who refused or neglected to be thus humbled, at the temple, and in the presence of the idol, were counted guilty of *heresy*, and were held as infidels and contemners of the gods.

Herodotus further says, that in his own time, B. C. 450, there was a city in *Numidia*, which was on the upper regions of the *Nile*, in Africa, that was called *Siccavenia*, a name signifying prostitution, to which the young women were compelled to resort by law, to earn their marriage dower. This custom, says Herodotus, was brought from Phœnicia, which was the country of old Canaan, peopled as we have often

said before, from the very beginning after the flood, by negro nations.

JOSEPHUS, in his Antiquities of the Jews, speaks of the madness of the Egyptians after women, in the place where he relates the story of Abraham's going down to Egypt with his wife Sarai: Gen. xii, 10, 20. By this it is seen that in those ancient ages, strangers of other nations and distant parts of the earth, considered it a dangerous thing to travel in Egypt in company with women. So notorious were they in this particular, even among themselves, that when the rich and noble lost by death, any *female* relative who had been reputed as handsome and pleasing to look upon, when living, they dare not send the body to the embalmers until they had been dead several days, lest their persons should become the objects of violation. See Clarke's comment on Gen. l, 2. Is there any thing which can be imagined by the human mind, more awful and repulsive than the above trait, of far more than *brutal* depravity.

When *Herodotus* traveled in Africa, among the various tribes of Egypt, Lybia, and Ethiopia, he says that he found the negro inhabitants living like animals, with respect to chastity. The following are his words on the subject: "Among *all* these nations whom I have specified, the communication between the sexes is like that of the beasts—open and unrestrained." Was *this* induced by slavery, as abolitionists say it is in America?

That those nations of whom he speaks were really the negroes of Africa, Herodotus says they were all of the same complexion with the Ethiopians, being

extremely black and curly headed. At their marriages, it is a custom every where among them, says the same author, for *all* the guests to enjoy the bride, the first night, who bring accordingly suitable presents, by which means they commence their family capacity, or house-keeping. In one tribe, he found it a custom for the wives to make use of a certain mark, or sign on their limbs, to denote the number of times they had favored other gallants than the lawful one after marriage; the husband valuing them according to the number of these tokens, as they were the evidences of their wives' popular personal charms.

This is a dreadful picture of the negro race, in that *one* particular, and were it not for the restraints of the Christian religion, and the salutary laws enacted under its influence in America, and other countries in Christendom, they, as a people, if left to themselves, would be guilty of the same things as anciently, for their natures are ever the same.

Another tribe, of whom this Grecian author speaks, who lived in the same unrestrained manner, in Africa, assembled every three moons in a grand conclave, when all the children born during that term of time, were examined as to their looks, countenances, and shapes; and the men they most resembled were obliged to father and take care of them, there being no other way to ascertain the parents of their children. Herodotus, pages 170, 235, 236, 237.

It is intimated by *Livy*, vol. 1, book xxi, p. 369, that the Carthagenian generals were guilty of the practice of Sodomy, and that even *Hannibal*, who

in his youth was very handsome for a black man, participated in the same horrible custom.

It is said, respecting the negroes of the West India Islands, who are all of African descent, that they consider any restraint laid on their promiscuous sexual intercourse, a hardship of the most grievous and oppressive nature, seeming to *center all* their happiness in enjoyments of that description. From this fact, it seems that from the time of Herodotus, which is more than two thousand years ago, the negro race, whether in Africa or the West Indies, whether under the influence of unrestrained paganism, or the healing balm of Christianity, are ever the same gross, brutal, fierce, sensual and devilish chracters, as a people, in reference to sexual commerce.

Damberger's account of the Africans, who we have before quoted in this work, accords with all we have said above, from whom we take the following in addition. This man says that he fell in with a tribe, who lived beyond the limits of the Caffrees, who were called by themselves, *Muhotians*. While with this tribe, as he and a negro man, the son-in-law of the chief of the *krall*, and with whom he then was remaining, were busy in gathering dry wood, in the edge of a wilderness, the former made Damberger a proposal of Sodomy. But as Damberger refused, the African nearly murdered him, being a much stronger man, and yet Damberger made his escape from the woolly-headed monster. While at this krall, the old chief, the father-in-law of the negro above spoken of, took Damberger, on a certain day, with him to another part of the same wilderness, where he was

shown a heap of sand and earth several feet high. On opening this heap, as directed by the chief, he found the bodies of five *white men*, who had been killed by stabbing. He soon learned of the old man, that the five men had belonged to the crew of a vessel which had but recently been wrecked on the coast of the Atlantic, and who had been carried inland by a party of blacks, belonging to the *Muhotian* tribe. This tribe had been set upon by a party of *Kantorians*, in order to take the prisoners out of their hands, for the express purpose of practicing Sodomy upon them, because they were *white*, and, in the eyes of those miserable beings, exceedingly handsome. But in the affray, the white men were all killed, and buried there in the sand, rather than submit to be thus degraded in their own eyes. During this talk with the filthy old chief, Damberger told him about the abuse he had received from his son-in-law, because he would not submit to the same thing; at which the old child of darkness and paganism only laughed most heartily, as at an occurrence of the most trivial character. Vol. i, p. 146.

After this, as Damberger was prosecuting his dreadful journey, over jagged mountains and dreary plains of sand and morasses, he fell into the hands of a tribe called *Kionians*, whose king was an absolute despot; having the power to appropriate to his own use whatever he pleased, and of whom his subjects dare not complain. Whenever he would, he took the wives and daughters of his people, who were very numerous, to his own couch, so that he had eight hundred women subject to his pleasure. The

place of his district or region of dwelling, was in the caves of certain mountains, called the *Kong mountains*, and adjacent to the river Niger, not a great distance from the Atlantic, which empties into that ocean at Liberia, in north lat. 6°. Vol. ii, p. 103.

ROLLIN says, that abominable lewdness, as stated by *Trogus Pompeius*, a Roman historian, was the great and predominant vice of all Africa. Vol. i, p. 375. On a subject like this, or any other, touching the character of the natives of Africa, the Romans had the most unbounded opportunity to know them in those ages, because they had a great empire in that country, which they wrested out of the hands of the Carthagenians, who had conquered the country some hundred years before, who were also a black people from Phœnicia, of whom we shall have something to remark hereafter.

The facts set forth in this section of the work, are, after all, but little items in the ocean of evidence that might be adduced, proving this people, the race of Ham, to be a people who, in all ages, have been more sensual and animal in their inclinations, than are the races of either the red or white man; which fact is an evidence of no small magnitude, of their real and universal mental inferiority.

This remark, we know, may be considered as severe, and yet we do not see how we can make any abatement, except to say that, happily, there have been, in all ages, *individuals* of the negro race, both as it relates to talent of the medium scale, and amiableness of character, who should be excepted from the great mass of the countless myriads of the

blacks, as good men, and ornaments to society where they lived.

Having thus far in this section, taken some notice of the national and personal character of the Ethiopian race, we shall change the subject, in order to make some inquiries respecting their mental abilities, without aiming to disparage them in the least degree wrongfully, being desirous only to ascertain the truth respecting them.

If the Supreme Being has seen fit to endow this race with a less quantum of intellectual faculties, and with less attractive powers and persons, in all respects, than he has the white race—what then? are we, therefore, to undervalue them on this account? We think not, as *all* God's works are good and proper in their proper places, but not out of them. In this way, and in no other, shall we be able to appreciate the wonderful harmony of nature, by which is demonstrated both the power and wisdom of the Creator, in ordering the affairs of the universe, and the inhabitants of the globe.

It is impossible to extract from substances, *more* than is contained in the *nature* of such substances, or to elevate by its own weight, water above its origin or fountain head. So of the negro race, though fondled and petted by abolitionists, yet this will amount to nothing, except an exhibition of the negro's real natural imbecilities of mind, and the need he is in of help, as the great conservative powers by which the white race have elevated themselves are not given to the people of the race of Ham. But for not cultivating the *one* talent, which was given them

by the Creator, they are placed under the ban of judicial decree, exactly suited to their moral characters on the earth.

> As erst before the flood when Satan reigned,
> The earth with violence and death was stained;
> The waters therefore came, and swept away
> The whole blasphemous host of vile array.
> So, in the land of Ham, old Canaan's coast,
> Where Sodomy and crime were black men's boast,
> The vengeful arm of God—the Jewish sword—
> Drove them headlong out, both tribe and horde.

NINTH SECTION.

Pretended *mental* equality of the negro race with white men refuted, as held by abolitionits—Comparative view of the races, as to their doings in the world—Proofs that the ancient Egyptians, nor any of the negro nations, were not the authors of either arts or sciences—Proofs that the arts and sciences, comprehending a knowledge of letters, were known before the flood, and in the house of Noah, and by the first patriarchs—Curious discoveries made in the foundations of the tower of Babel by Sir Robert Ker Porter—A knowledge of letters since the flood derived from the first patriarchs, and not from the Phœnician blacks—But little advances made in architecture by the first Egyptians, till after Solomon—The pyramids built by the shepherd kings, a race of copper colored men of the blood of Shem, and not by the blacks of Egypt—For thousands of years the tribes of Africa have made no advances in civilization—The *reasons* of this—Works of the Canaanites, as it related to architecture, derived from the Euphrates, or the example of the Shemites, and the people of Japheth—During the whole history of negro Carthage, they made no advances in literature—Rapine, plunder, and dealing in slaves, being their trade—Architectural works of the races of Shem and Japheth long before the tower was built, or the negroes exit to Africa—Near resemblance of the Simia race as the ourang-outang, and many of the Africans—Respecting their appetites—Cannibalism, &c., in all ages—Insensibilities of the negroes to bodily pain—Meanness of the negro spirit—Their cruelties to their slaves—With many other curious matters.

THE labor of the following pages which shall occupy this section, will be to ascertain whether the negro race, properly so distinguished, in an unamalgamated character, are naturally equal with the other

races of men, the red and the white, in point of intellectual faculties. That they really are thus equal, is vehemently contended for by all abolitionists of both Europe and America, some even holding them superior, while *anti-abolitionists* resist this opinion as a fallacy. An appeal to direct, and also to circumstantial evidence, in relation to the subject, is the only way to decide it.

Abolitionists are *sure* that the only reason of their present amazing inferiority arises wholly from the influence of the treatment of the white nations toward them. Remove this say they, educate them, and give them a fair chance in the world, then it will soon be seen, that, as a people, they are equally talented with the other races of the human family.

But here, at the very outset of the inquiry, it is desirable to ascertain how it came to pass that it was *not* the negro man who aspired to the paramount condition, *now* and always enjoyed by the white race. If the people of Ham were *originally* equal, as to mental faculties, with the other races, how came they in their present degraded condition? How has it happened that the negro race has not attained in the world to the very same condition the white race now occupy, and the whites fallen into the condition of the blacks, seeing they are, as is contended, *equal* with each other? or, if this is true, why are they not alike? There must be some great reason for this. It is asserted by abolitionists, that the negro race were, in the first ages after the flood, the authors of all the arts and sciences which obtained in ancient Egypt, and that from these arose, as from a germ, the pres-

ent lights of mankind. If this was true, we ask how they, the authors, in their posterity, have lost that enviable position? How has it come to pass that the same *power* which prompted them to *so* many, and to *so* great improvements, has not been able to sustain itself? Could this be shown to have been a fact, respecting the negro race, it would prove an anomaly indeed, and yet would secure but little in their favor, on account of the horrid *retrograde* they have made in the world.

But we affirm that they were not the authors of either *arts* or *sciences*, as understood in those times, which, according to history, as well as the scriptures, were cultivated in ancient Africa. We sustain this affirmation, by showing that the Egyptians, and all other people of those ages, *received* and carried with them a knowledge of the arts and sciences, as understood at that era of the world, from the house of NOAH.

That *letters* were known in the house of Noah is absolutely *certain*, deduced from many circumstances, and of necessity to all the people, or to heads of tribes and communities for the first few hundred years, immediately after the flood. One of these circumstances, or evidences, arises from the late discoveries made in the foundations of the ancient tower of Belus, or Babel, as it is commonly called, as well as from the architectural works of the people of Shem and Japheth before the tower was built.

Sir Robert Ker Porter, under the patronage of the government of England, went to the country of ancient Persia, Tartary, Armenia, Chaldea, and Baby-

lon on the Euphrates, in the years 1820 and 1823, on a tour of antiquarian discovery. While on the Euphrates, he found, as reported in his work, the ancient site of the temple of Belus, or tower of Babel, the same spoken of by Moses in the book of Genesis, which was built by Nimrod the Grandson of Ham. [*See Plate*]. At the spot where the tower stood, which was built only about one hundred years after the flood, he found a vast heap of rubbish, forming a great mound, or elevation, overgrown with brambles.

Being desirous of examining the interior of this mighty mound, he procured the aid of several of the people living there, to dig along its skirts, when there was found, at some little depth, the original brick, forming the upper stratas of the foundation of the structure. The bricks thus discovered were about one foot square by three inches thick, and were covered on both sides with arrow-headed characters, having, in many respects, a resemblance to the present Hebrew letters.

They were not hieroglyphics, or the pictures of creatures or things, but were evidently letters, or signs of ideas, placed in due order, as letters are now arranged, running in parallel lines across the bricks. There were instances, however, where those characters were set in perpendicular lines, or at right angles with the others. That they were letters, is as evident as that any of the ancient characters of the Hebrew, Greek, Persian, or Chinese languages, are letters.

On these bricks was written, no doubt, the history of the tower, and the reasons of its being erected, the

story of the flood, the ark, and of the nations before the flood, the original creation, &c. It appears that the letters were formed on the insides of the molds in which the bricks were made, the characters being raised out above the general level of the face of the mold, so that when impressed on the clay before it was dried for burning, would cause fac similes in the face of the brick, and thus be preserved from being broken when laid in great masses on top of each other. It may have been, however, that the letters were made by merely pressing down on each brick, as it came from a *smooth* mold, the type of a letter carved out of wood, and thus produce the same effect as if cast in a mold.

Specimens of these letters may be seen in the work alluded to above, in great numbers, and are worthy of the attention of the curious. The work is in the State Library.

That letters were known *before* the flood, appears also from the fact that *music* was taught and understood among the antediluvians: see Gen. iv, 21, where it is said that one *Jubal*, a descendant of the family of Cain, was the *father* [instructor] of all such as handled the harp and the organ. If music was taught, then of necessity they must have had a knowledge of *characters* of a competent description, by the means of which they recorded their music, or the science could not have been alluded to, as it is by Moses. If musical characters were then in use, of which there can be no doubt, then, of necessity, *letters* were also in use, or the *rules* of such as taught music could not have been systematically accom-

plished. Music being thus understood by the antediluvians, it is an evidence that they possessed a high condition of refinement, as a general knowledge of *this* accomplishment is considered the *ne plus ultra* of good breeding in *refined* society of every age. To carry out this belief, we are aided by Moses in another respect, who says, Gen. iv, 22, that the people of that age, going back to the lifetime of Adam, had a knowledge of the manufacture of *brass* and iron, and that they were also agriculturists, as well as shepherds and herdsmen. It is said by the Jewish Rabbi that letters and writing were invented by *Seth*, the third son of Adam.—*Watson's Theological Dictionary*, p. 856.

With the knowledge of such things, can it be possible that the antediluvians were not a civilized, laboring, trading, agricultural, mechanical, commercial, and scientific race? However many tribes, nations, kingdoms, and governments, they may have been divided into around the whole globe, yet a knowledge of such refinements is stated by Moses to have certainly been in their possession. Of all this, is it possible that Noah, being born six hundred years before the flood, could have been ignorant, seeing he was a good man, and improved his mind, therefore, in every possible way.

Could he have planned and built the ark without a knowledge of *geometry*, which also supposes the existence and use of arithmetical characters? Ham, Nimrod, and his coadjutors, must have had a knowledge of *geometry*, as well as of *letters*, or they could not have projected, nor have built the tower, and the

great cities *Erech*, *Acad*, and *Calneh*, in the land of *Shinar*, on the river Euphrates, as Moses says they did. Gen. x, 10.

From whom did *Abraham*, who was born only two hundred and ninety-two years after the flood, derive a knowledge of arithmetic and astronomy, if not from the house of Noah? That Abraham had this knowledge is stated by Josephus, in his book of Jewish Antiquities. If Abraham had this knowledge, then it is clear that the *Syrians*, of which people Abraham was a member, also possessed it, who, with all the *first* nations immediately after the flood, derived it, as well as all other knowledge, from the house and members of the family of Noah, who brought it with them from beyond the flood in written characters.

That Abraham was an educated man, is evident from the character he sustained among his countrymen, the Chaldeans, or the ancient Syrians, and as the head and patriarch of the Hebrew or Jewish people, as well as from the business which he transacted with the Egyptians, Canaanites, and other countries of that age. If Abraham, then, was an educated man, and was versed in all the learning of that age, which was cultivated by the *Chaldeans*, who, doubtless, at that era, and upward, toward the age of the *ending* of the flood, was composed of both *white* and red men, till such times as they were separated to their respective regions; then were also the patriarchs, who were *before* Abraham's time, such as Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, and Terah, the *father* of Abraham, as well as *Shem*, who was *Mel-*

chisedek, and the progenitor of all the patriarchs above named.

From this state of the case, it is not hard to conceive that the Egyptian and Canaanite *negroes*, who were the very first people of those countries, received *all* their knowledge of *letters*, of *agriculture*, of *geometry*, *arithmetic*, and *astronomy*, from the great and common source, the house of Noah, and the succeeding patriarchs. The opinion, therefore, that the Phœnician negroes were the inventors of letters is no authority.

What though *Cadmus*, an Egyptian, as it is said, carried the knowledge of letters into Greece first of all, at a very remote age, which we shall not dispute, yet this does not prove that the Egyptians invented them, as *Cadmus*, with the rest of his countrymen, derived that knowledge from the common source—the family of Noah. Whether this Cadmus, who is celebrated as the author of letters among the ancient Greeks, and the succeeding ages of the world, was a Phœnician or an Egyptian negro, is far from being certain; for we learn from Josephus's Jewish Antiquities, book 8, that one of the sons of *Ishmael*, the son of Abraham, was named *Cadmus*, and was as likely to have been the Cadmus of ancient history, who carried letters into Greece, as any other man.

As to architecture of the magnificent and exquisite descriptions, the Egyptians made but little advances till the age of Solomon, previous to which time their buildings were of the most common order, made of brick, both burnt and dried; even the cities of the time of *Joseph* were of this description, useful and

spacious, but not approaching to the magnificent. In all Africa, says the "Universal Traveler," page 499, there does not now exist among the negroes any architecture, above that of mere huts made of stakes driven in the ground, and plastered inside and out; of this description are their best buildings, shaped like bee-hives, conically. The rest are mere dens made of mud and sticks, or holes in the ground. These are the descendants of the mighty Egyptians, the Lybians, and Ethiopians, whose lofty temples once filled Africa, if we are to believe abolitionists; but it is all an error; they were the authors of the architectural works of those ages no further than as slaves and laborers. The pyramids, which were built of hewn stone, was not the work of the woolly heads of Egypt, but of the shepherd kings called *Cuthea*, from Arabia and the Persian Gulf, north of Egypt, who held, by conquest, for more than two hundred years, the kingdoms of Egypt, during which time they enslaved the whole mass of the aboriginal people, when the pyramids, and many other great works, were built by slaves, at the dictation of the Hyc-sos, or shepherd kings.— *Watson.*

This was done *prior* to the time of Joseph's being sold into Egypt. The Hyc-sos kings were of the *Abrahamic* race, being descendants of his sons by *Keturah* (see Gen. xxv), who, settling eastward from Chaldea, where Abraham lived *before* he went to Canaan, expelled the children of Ham, or the Cushites, from the country, who, first of all, after the fall of the tower, settled there, on which account the country was alluded to by Moses (Gen. ii, 13), by the name of

Ethiopia, through which the *Gihon* flowed. This people, being thus expelled, went to Africa, and founded another kingdom, which also was called Ethiopia.

Now, on this account, the Hyc-sos race were called *Cushite Shepherds*, namely, because they had conquered and dwelt in the country of the expelled Cushite race, who were of the house of *Ham*. These were the people who conquered Egypt at so early a period, and built the great works of that country above named.

The Cushites, as stated by Richard Watson, in his Historical Dictionary, p. 282, were driven out of their Asiatic possessions, along the gulf of Persia, and along the northern side of the Red Sea, by the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, both of the lineage of Abraham.

The descendants of Abraham were always prone to rearing vast herds of cattle, by which means, in a great measure, they acquired wealth and power. Such were the shepherd kings, who, for a time, tyrranized over Egypt, as above shown. It was for this very reason, that all *shepherds* were an abomination to the Egyptians, in the days of Joseph, the Hebrew, as stated Gen. xlvi, 34, for they remembered the cruelties of the red skinned shepherd kings.

From all points, therefore, it is evident, that the original negroes of the Nile, the swarthy woolly heads of the race of Ham, did not profit by a knowledge of *letters*, or any other knowledge of the house of Noah, above mere agriculture, till such times as other races of men, such as Ishmaelites, Midianites,

and Chaldeans, all of the race of Shem and Abraham, had begun to mingle with them: so that by the time of *Saul*, *David*, and Solomon, the character of Egypt in relation to enterprise, had become vastly changed from her ancient stupidity; from whence we date what may be denominated the *architectural* age of Egypt.

At a very early period, thousands of the Ishmaelite race settled in Africa, by invasion, along the head waters of the Nile, in Ethiopia, mingling more and more through Egypt, down toward the mouths of that river; this is a matter of history. *Watson*, 282. This is evident also from the mummies brought from that country, which were doubtless embalmed as long ago as in the days of David and Solomon, and perhaps as far back as when the Hebrews were in Egypt; all of which, except now and then *one*, are not of the negro race, but of a red or copper colored people, with long straight hair, and other characteristics not belonging to the genuine Cushite, or race of Ham.

From this circumstance, it is shown that the *ruling* people of Egypt, in those ages, were not the native negroes, as none but the more wealthy were able to bear the expense of embalming their dead. "That a race (says Professor Lawrence, p. 294) ever devoted, within the period embraced by authentic history, to slavery, or to an existence not much better, and possessing, under the most favorable circumstances, only the *rudiments* of the common arts, and the most imperfect social institutions, should have occupied, in remotest antiquity, undertakings which astonish us

even *now* by their grandeur, and prove so great a progress in civilization and social life, in arts and sciences—that they should have subsequently lost *all this surprising progress*, and never have exhibited the smallest approximation to such a pre-eminence in any other instance, is a fact extremely difficult to explain."

The negroes of Africa, who are the descendants of the Egyptians, the Lybians, and the Ethiopians, all the same people, the race of Ham, the first negroes, for thousands of years, have made no advances in letters, or in any way approximating thereto; as in all Africa, among the negro tribes and kingdoms, not a *gleam* of the light of science, the precursor of which is the invention of *letters*, has appeared. Not a hieroglyphic or symbol—no kind of painting, or even *knots* tied in a string, as in *Peru*, called *quipos*, to denote numbers, has appeared in all the vast regions, of Southern Africa.

How is this? what has induced this amazing stupidity of the native negro? In the annals of no people of the whole earth, can there be found evidence of so profound a state of ignorance and apathy, with respect to a desire of improvement, as among this people, for they have not exceeded the beasts of the wilderness, where they dwell, who follow the mere instincts of their natures.

But in the northern parts of Africa, on account of the mixture of the other races with that of the negro blood, there has arisen more or less improvement in agriculture and government, which has elevated the negro blood a little above their native dead level of their degraded natures.

What though the negroes of Canaan built many towns and cities in their country, such as *Jebus*, *Tyre*, *Zidon*, *Gath*, *Hamath*, *Jericho*, with many others, which Joshua and his warriors found extremely difficult to destroy? And although before their settlement in Canaan, they built the tower of *Babel*, the cities of *Acad*, *Erech*, and *Calneh*, in the land of *Shinar*, on the *Euphrates;* yet all this, and especially the cities last named, which were built by the negroes, before they settled in Canaan, and before the confusion of their language, we attribute to the first impetus of knowledge derived from the house of Noah, and kept alive by surrounding circumstances, the exertions of other nations—the Shemites and the children of Japheth. But when finally overcome and subdued by the *superior* policies of the other races, the negro man not possessing in himself the great conservative powers, which are the grand source of all exertions and human independence, fell, naturally by degrees, back into their native insufficiency of mind; the end of which is misery, ignorance, barbarism and slavery.

During the age of their first prosperity, had they cultivated such mental faculties as they had, instead of indulging in all kinds of animal luxuries, crimes, murders, tyranny, lewdness, and horrid idolatries, they would not have gone down as they have. That such was the fact, respecting them, is strongly supported by the history of *Carthage*, whose empire was coeval with the latter ages of Canaan, and with the very time of the glory of Egypt. This negro kingdom, during its whole existence, which was from the

age of *Ahab*, one of the kings of Israel, till destroyed by the Romans, under Scipio, about 140 years B. C., made no advances in literature. On this subject, *Rollin* says, p. 238, that during all the ages of their existence, which was about seven hundred years, they did not produce but four literary men, while the Greeks and the Romans, we will add, during the same space of time, filled the world with their sages, philosophers, and seats of learning, as well as with their manufactories, trade and commerce.

The great ambition of the negro Carthagenians was war, plunder, rapine, and cruelty; excluding, even by *edicts*, the encouragement of letters and learning. Wherever the Greeks or Romans carried their conquests, they strove to better the condition of conquered countries, but the Carthagenians turned all to a howling wilderness; or at least did not attempt to better the character of the subdued nations. The reason why the Carthagenians discouraged literature by *law*, says Rollin, was, as they asserted, that it assisted men to become rogues, and to overreach each other.

But this was not the reason; it was because of their *innate* dislike to mental study and research, as a people; seeking only after animal gratification, seeing no beauty or advantage in a knowledge of the mysteries of the arts and sciences, as did the other races, especially the descendants of Japheth. This is the grand reason why the first negro nations went backward rather than forward from their original opportunities, namely, their not having appreciated the value and worth of *letters*, moral improvement, the

science of social government, virtue, &c.; and yet we are told that the negro man invented letters at first; an idea easily refuted, by a reference to the fact, that letters and learning were understood in the house of Noah long before Ham was born.

In relation to their commonly accredited knowledge of the art of building, or of architecture, in Egypt, is entirely preposterous. "With our present knowledge (says Lawrence, page 296) of the capacity of negro men, and our knowledge of the state in which the *whole* race has remained for full twenty centuries, can we deem it possible that they should have achieved such prodigies?" That the negro man in those ages did, unaided by the talents of others, invent and carry out, by his own mental energies, the great works of Egypt and Carthage, we wholly deny, and aver that it cannot be proven.

That the knowledge of architecture, and many of the other arts, as well as sciences, were as well understood, if not better, by the *Chaldeans*, who were of the race of Shem, and coeval with the negroes of the tower of Babel, which was long prior to the settlements of Egypt or Ethiopia, is evident from the notices respecting them, found in the writings of Moses in the book of Genesis. The settlements of *Shem* and *Japheth*, about the regions of the head waters of the Euphrates and Tigris, in ancient Persia (so named long afterward) and Armenia, were made all a hundred years before the children of Ham went either to Canaan or Egypt.

It is true, however, that Ham and his people went down the Euphrates to the vale of Shinar, where, in

about fifty years after his leaving the country of the ark, with his family, they built the tower. But as soon as that undertaking was frustrated by the Divine power, in the confusion of their language, they immediately spread out in all directions: some going westward to the unknown region of the country called, afterward, Canaan Phœnicia; some southward, along the Persian Gulf, in Arabia, and the Red Sea, as well as still further south into Egypt, while some went south-east, along the Indian Ocean, toward the country now known as Hindostan; and others remained, no doubt, in the same country, along the Euphrates, quite down to the sea. Here they had to begin *anew* in all their respective regions.

But during all this time, the children of Shem and Japheth, with the patriarchs born soon after the flood, were going forward with their pursuits, and actually built the great cities of *Rehoboth*, *Calah*, and *Resen*, Genesis x, 11, 12, even *before* the time of the building of the tower of Babel by the negroes, as the children of Shem and Japheth had nothing to do with that exploit.

The numbers and the names of some of the patriarchs, born prior to the dispersion of the blacks from the project of the tower, are as follows: ARPHAXAD, SALAH, EBER, and PELEG, besides four other sons of Shem, younger than Arphaxad, whose names were *Elam*, *Ashur*, *Lud*, and *Amram;* who were each, and all of them, the fathers of vast multitudes, over whom the mighty and princely *Melchisedek*, or SHEM, the son of Noah, reigned as a priest. In this man were concentrated, by the providence and appoint-

ment of God, the regal and sacerdotal dignities, as well as a knowledge of all past ages, as he was born more than a hundred years before the flood.

Is it a supposable case, that the races of Shem and Japheth, under such a supervision as that of Noah and Melchisedek, were idle, and accomplished nothing, during all the time the negroes were busy on the great flats of Shinar, and in the building of the tower? The reader will recollect that Noah lived, after the flood, three hundred and fifty years, and *Shem five hundred* years; so that during a hundred years or more, prior to the negroes' settlements of Canaan and Africa, these two great men, as well as the four other patriarchs, first above named, were as energetically at work in their settlements, east and north, as were the negroes in theirs, and that, too, without a loss of time, as was the case with the blacks; for they lost all the time spent in the vale of Shinar, before they were dispersed, amounting to more than a hundred years.

That the race of *Shem*, under the advices and knowledge of himself and his father Noah, and concomitant patriarchs, had actually grown numerous, and attained to power at a very early period, is evident from the xivth chapter of Genesis. In the history contained in that chapter, Moses gives an account of a war waged and carried on between certain kings of the land of Shinar, whose countries lay along and beyond the river Euphrates, who were the children of Shem, and certain kings of Canaan, negroes, and of the vale of Sodom, whose kingdoms lay

along and near the river Jordan, places and governments about three hundred miles apart.

The names of the kings of *Shinar*, who engaged in this war, were *Amraphel*, king of Shinar; *Arioch*, king of Ellasar; *Chedorlaomar*, king of Elam; and *Tidal*, king of nations. This war happened in the days of Abraham, about two hundred and fifty years after the dispersion from the tower, and about three hundred and seventy after the flood, when Abraham was about eighty years old.

These confederate kings, from the Euphrates, were powerful, as we see they had held in vassalage, for some twelve years, certain districts of the country of Sodom, on the river Jordan, *east* of the country of old Canaan, although so far from the seats of the respective thrones. But the kingdoms of Sodom rebelled from under the rule of those eastern kings. On this account, the five kings of the Euphrates, with their troops, came the great distance of full three hundred miles overland, to reduce the people to their vassalage again.

But the sooty monarchs of Sodom, five in number, whose names are as follows, *Bera*, king of Sodom; *Birsha*, king of Gomorrah; *Shinab*, king of Admah; *Shemeber*, king of Zeboim; and *Bela*, king of Zoar, mustered their troops and resisted their oppressors, but were beaten, with a terrible overthrow, in which defeat *Lot*, the half brother of Abraham, and all he had, was carried away. Thus we learn, from the pen of Moses, how great the empire of those eastern monarchs was, extending *west*, even to Jordan, covering, at that time, more or less of the country of

old Canaan, while to the *east* there was nothing beyond them but the wilds of India and Hindostan.

Thus far we have presented this trait of ancient history, merely to show, that at the very time when the Egyptians had been settled in the vale of the Nile, only about two hundred and fifty years from the time of the dispersion from Babel, there was *then* a mighty empire much further advanced in the arts and sciences (than were the Egyptians) in the country of Euphrates; which had its commencement long before even the building of Babel, and had spread onward toward the region now called China, to a great distance, and had been advancing for more than a hundred years before the negroes of the tower, or any part of them, had found their way to the Nile, or to the mountains of Canaan.

In this eastern empire, there were no less than eight great cities named by Moses, which were *Babel*, *Erech*, *Acad*, and *Calneh*, built by the people of Ham, under Nimrod, before the confusion of their language; and then there were *Nineveh*, *Rehoboth*, *Calah*, and *Resen*, built by the people of Shem, quite as early as were the others by the people of Ham, who were dispossessed of them, and driven out of the country, by the Shemite race, into Africa. From this view, it is seen at once that the arts, as understood in that age, were known in the land of Shinar, Armenia, and the east, long prior to the advancement of the Canaanites, the Ethiopians, the Lybians, and the Egyptians, derived from the house of Noah, and fostered by the patriarchs of the Shemite and Japhetic races.

That Abraham, the great progenitor of many of the nations of the eastern world, was a learned man, is asserted in the writings of several of the early Chaldean historians, as stated by Josephus, book 1. Berosseus, a Chaldean historian, speaks of this Abraham, the Syrian, as being wonderfully versed in a knowledge of the heavenly bodies, or in astronomy. Hecatus, another Chaldean writer, celebrates the greatness and the learning of the man Abraham, who, as Josephus relates, composed a book, setting forth the life of Abraham, by which means his name was well known to the ancient writers of India and Hindostan. To this Adam Clarke sets his seal, who says, that in the oriental writings in the Sanscrit language, frequent allusion is made to *Abraham*, as well as to *Solomon ben-Doud;* or, in other words, to Solomon, the son of David.

It is said by Josephus, that Abraham carried with him to Egypt a knowledge of arithmetic; which is borne out in the fact of his seed, both the Hebrews and the Ishmaelites, always being in the possession of the science of figures. And from whom did Abraham receive this knowledge, but from *Shem*, or *Melchisedek*, the son of Noah, which came from beyond the flood?

How is it, therefore, that literary men of the latter ages have seemed to look for the origin of the arts and sciences no higher than to the sooty cities of Egypt or Phœnicia, with all this evidence before them, as if the negro man must have been the first and only discoverers of all that is excellent in the earth, especially when it is known that this race have

never of themselves, as negroes, patronized letters much in the world.

Is it a credible thing that God, who committed to the race of Shem, in the persons of the patriarchs of that line, the lights of immortality, did not also commit to the same characters and race, the lights of the arts and sciences, seeing that a knowledge of these very powers were necessary to the carrying out of the very plans of the Deity, by the means of a branch of this race of men, the Shemites?

Professor Lawrence, a man who ranks among the first men of the age, contends in his lectures, that as all the black nations of the globe are in a low and miserable condition; and that, as they have been thus for thousands of years, therefore they are correspondingly low and miserable in their *faculties*, and is the very reason why they submit to slavery. He deems the *moral* and intellectual character of the negro race, decidedly inferior to that of the white race, and that this condition arises out of his *anatomical* organization—p. 428. Than that this is *so*, there is no truth more self-evident, and yet there are found even among white men and women, and of such as lay claim to high distinction in society, those who do not hesitate to aver, that there is no good reason why an amalgamation of white and black blood should not take place.

Without reciting in this place all the physical peculiarities of the shape, color, and character of the negro race, it may suffice to remark, that when the two races come in contact, and the thoughts of amalgamation crosses the mind of a white, it is accom-

panied with a chill of the soul, which is nothing else but the voice of God in nature against it. The sympathies when called upon, in *this* respect, to coalesce with a creature of another cast and constitution, cry out and flee with affright, as if pursued by some horrid phantom of darkness; *surely*, God never intended any such jumbling up of his original work, as amalgamation proposes.

As to the *natural* manners of the negro race, there is between them and the other races, a deeply marked difference in relation to the risible faculty. The continual readiness of the African to burst into loud and boisterous fits of laughter, increasing even to yells, with but little or no cause to excite it, is a trait entirely peculiar to that people. This peculiarity, which so attaches to the very being of the negro race was equally possessed by Ham, the first negro, as appears in his treatment of the patriarch Noah, in the hour of his sleep, as we have already shown from Josephus.

There is another circumstance in the physical being of many of the African race, of which we almost decline to speak, and this is the strange and unaccountable circumstance of their near approach in their shapes, to that of the wild man of the woods, the ourang-outang.

If it was consistent in the Divine economy to produce a black race of men, as in the person of Ham, suited in their constitutional make, to people the hot regions of the earth, why need they, therefore, in so many instances, be formed so much like the animal above alluded to? Could not the African have been

produced black, with all the peculiar temperaments of body and mind, without their having been formed so much like that strange looking creature, to the black man's deep dislike, as well as to the surprise of all who have seen any of that kind of animal?

The ourang-outang is a most extraordinary creature, not only on account of its near approach to the form of many of the African race, but also from its almost human actions, great size, and greater strength. Some individuals of the species, which have been taken, have measured full seven feet in height, and were otherwise as largely proportioned. Such an one was caught on the northern coast of the island *Sumatra*, in the Indian Ocean, which was a real giant. The account given by Dr. Clark Abel, respecting the capture and size of this extraordinary animal, is as follows: "When first observed, the creature seemed to be much fatigued, as if he were resting from a long and arduous journey His legs, nearly to the knees, were covered with mud, showing that he had passed a region of country of a boggy or miry character, and was resting in the broad forks of a tree, when first seen by the hunters, near the shores of the island. As the boat's crew approached the land, the monster appeared to be aware of its danger, and that a single tree, whereon it was resting, did not afford adequate means of safety. It, therefore, descended, and escaping to a small clump of forest trees, at some distance, whither it was now pursued by the hunters, seemed to feel itself more secure. But as the hunters came up, they let off their guns, five at the first shot, the balls of which all took effect. On

feeling itself wounded, the wonderful animal left the tree on which it was resting for the moment, and bounded with great activity and force, from one tree to another, so that for a time it seemed to bid defiance to the hunters to overtake it. At length, however, its exertions grew fainter, and leaning against a limb, it vomited blood, being then some feet up among the limbs of the tree, in which it was putting its trust. The powder of the party being now exhausted, as they had been on the hunt for a long time that day, before they fell in with this rencontre, they were obliged to cut the trees down with their axes in order to be able to strike it with their spears. The animal was soon cut down, but as the tree fell, what was their surprise to see the wild man spring with great activity into the boughs of another, thus effecting its escape with seemingly unabated vigor. They now fell to cutting down all the trees of the place, which consisted of but a small clump, as they were determined to capture it by a conflict on the ground. This plan was accomplished, and the last tree brought the animal in immediate conflict with its enemies. Here they plied their spears on every side, as the bleeding animal bounded hither and thither amidst its foes, without seeming desirous of attacking any of them. But as it was overcome by many wounds, and nearly in a dying state, it suddenly seized hold of a spear, the handle of which no man could break, and snapped it asunder, as if it were but a dry twig. Its strength, however, they now saw was beginning to fail from a loss of blood; when in its agony, it would clap its hands on the wounds and look so pitiful at

its tormentors, that the men began to have doubts as to the nature of the deed they were perpetrating, so much were its actions like a human being in distress. But soon it fainted, and fell down on the grass quiescent, and was dead. On measuring the strange creature, it was found to be seven feet in length, and looked, while alive, and bounding from one tree to another, like a monster of a man, entirely naked, but overgrown with a thick coat of black, shiny hair, of about three inches long, except on the forehead and face. Its chin was fringed with a beard, which curled neatly on each side. Its arms were long—much longer than are a man's arms—while the legs were in proportion shorter, presenting a body of great size and power. The chest was broad and expanded, while the waist was quite slender, as are all the monkey tribes. The posteriors were pointed and narrow, which trait of form is also that of the African negroes. Upon the whole, says Dr. Abel, it was a wonderful creature to behold, and more about it to excite surprise than fear."

Mr. Shaw, the Wesleyan missionary in South Africa, says, that he has seen a whole troop of baboons on the mountains, who would not only scream, caper, and frolic at sight of their company, but would actually *laugh*.—Page 79 of his Memorials.

The existence of this animal, the ourang-outang, is a great phenomenon in the world of beasts, on account of its near approach to human beings, and especially to that of the negro race, both in form and capacities. The extreme scarcity of the creature in the world is not the *least* circumstance of its singu-

larity, for it is found only in one or two districts of the whole globe, and those are in Africa; we mean the *large* class of the animal. Because there is a palpable similarity in many particulars between the negro race, and the extraordinary animal above described, we by no means insinuate, what many seem to believe, namely, that they are a connecting link between the ourang-outang and the white man; as this is utterly impossible, on account of Ham's *parentage*, and because there *is* no such thing as a gradation from brute natures to that of the human; for man stands alone, being the image of God, and his only image on the planet. Our remarks, therefore, as above, and those which are to follow, are intended only to prove the natural and innocent fact of the negroes' *mental* and physical existence as actually inferior to the whites. In connection with this view, we shall notice the very curious circumstance of the difference there is between the *nature* of a negro's *flesh*, and that of the white man, the knowledge of which is afforded by the appetites of certain animals. The *shark*, the *lion*, *tiger*, and *leopard*, prefer the flesh of the negro to that of white men. This is found to be true as to the shark, when the two races bathe together in waters inhabited by that voracious fish; it always selects the blacks, as an article of food suited to its taste, rather than the whites, rejecting the latter to the last. It is the same when white men and negroes hunt the animals of the forest, above mentioned, together in Africa, those monsters always selecting the blacks as their prey, when it is as easy for them to take one as the other. Were we to ren

der a reason for this curious preference, we should say that it is on account of the strong odor of the negro's body, which, to the smell and taste, is more inviting than the white man's flesh, as is the smell and taste of the *horse* and the *ass* to those carnivorous creatures. In conformity to this fact, that of the strong odor of the negro's body, they can digest food of a much coarser and stronger character than white men can, such as the shark, the crocodile, the rhinoceros, the elephant, the hippopotamus, tigers, hyænas, dogs, lions, panthers, and serpents of every description, with the greatest ease and relish. All these are rejected by the white man, as abhorrent to his nature, tastes, and powers of digestion, except in cases of strong necessity and starvation. The horrid and heart-appalling practice of *cannibalism*, has, in *all* ages, attached more to the African race than to any other people of the earth. In the country of Egypt, according to *Baron Humboldt*, as late as the thirteenth century, five hundred years ago, this dreadful practice prevailed, even among the higher orders of the people, as well as the lower, so that extraordinary *traps* and *snares* were resorted to, in order to catch each other for food, as they would any other animal. He says, that physicians were often sent for, under a pretense of illness, when they who sent for them would kill and devour the physician, having arranged the plan how to deceive and destroy them before their arrival. The large island Sumatra, in the Indian Ocean, is peopled by blacks of the negro description, who, formerly, if not now, devoured all persons among them, condemned to death for crimes

committed against their laws. The manner of such executions was as follows. The criminal was tied naked to a post firmly fixed in the ground, while the executioners stood around the fatal spot with knives in their hands, who, when the sign for them to begin was given, fell on, in a regular manner, in the sight of thousands, cutting away such parts of the body as their respective fancies and appetites made choice of, eating the quivering flesh in its blood, with pepper and salt, while the poor wretch was howling and writhing with pain, as his devourers, all negroes like himself, were chewing and swallowing him down before his own eyes with gestures of great delight and satisfaction.—*Masonic Record*, p. 123, No. 1, 1830. In New Holland, there are, or *were*, several tribes of negroes, who have very large heads and mouths. Their heads, in form, resemble the head of the ourang-outang. They are entirely covered with black hair or wool, are very limited in their intellectual powers, but are extremely dexterous in climbing trees, precipices, and rocky places, in which particular they greatly resemble the apes and baboons of Africa. They are exceedingly black, and have mouths much wider than any other people of the human race. They eat all kinds of reptiles, as bugs, worms, and serpents, with every decayed and filthy thing; but whether they are *cannibals* we are not informed. Nearly the same is said of the *natives* of Australasia, who are small in stature, ill shaped, and among the most degraded and barbarous of the whole human race, going entirely naked, with their bodies smeared over like the Hottentot's, with oil and filth, having no

religion, or idea of a God, no government, and none of the comforts of civilized life, though occupying a country rich in every natural advantage of the globe.—*Smith's Geo.*, p. 296. Were ever white men so low as this?

On the island called Van Dieman's Land, in the Southern Ocean, lat. 42°, which is adjacent to New Holland, there is, according to *Captain Grant's* account, a tribe of negroes extremely black and woolly, whose whole formation is frightfully like the ourang-outang, being, as to stature, many of them full six feet high, and powerfully built, who are far stronger than other men of their size, and very ferocious. These negroes eat human flesh as freely as they do any other meat, making no difference, one way or another, in the light of its being better or worse than the flesh of other creatures. They sleep in the open air, although the country is far from being hot, as it is in lat. 42° south, and full as cold as is the climate of New York, in both winter and summer; and yet they sleep in the open air on the ground, and in the trees, like the wild tenants of the heavens and the earth, huddling in caves and holes in the winter, as well as they can.

The negroes of the Norfolk, or New Hebrides Islands, in the Pacific Ocean, make use of human flesh and count it as a great luxury—a banquet of the highest order.—*Malte-Brun*, p. 620. In the island Mallicola, in the Indian Ocean, according to the above author, is a race or tribe of negroes, who, it is said, may almost be regarded as a kind of apes or baboons; as they have long flat noses, narrow fore-

heads, high cheek bones, under jaws which protrude beyond what is common to Africans, very low of stature, and every way entirely horrible to look upon, on account of their extraordinary approximation to the shapes and attitudes of ourang-outangs.

The negroes of Solomon's Islands, in the Pacific Ocean, south latitude 10°, are exceedingly black and cruel; whose chiefs will kill a man, for happening to cross their shadow, so despotic and fierce are they in their anger. They wear around their bodies, as ornaments, strings of human teeth, and other tokens of ferocity and murderous practices. These negroes are cannibals of the worst description, living on human flesh, in preference to all other kinds of meat, which they procure by wars among themselves, and from shipwrecked vessels, which are cast by tempests on these inhospitable and bloody shores.

But from whence came the negroes of those islands of the Pacific Ocean, so far removed from Africa, their native country? We believe them to be descendants of the *Cushites*, who settled, first of all, and before they went to Africa, along the Persian Gulf, and the Eastern Ocean, from whence they got on to these islands, by various means, where they have remained from that period till the present. The islands of New Hebrides, New Holland, Van Dieman, New Zealand, and Solomon's Islands, with many others, which are inhabited by negroes, lie all along adjacent to the coasts of Asia, so that they were easily reached by these first settlers, of the *Ethiopia* of that country, *before* they were conquered and driven out of it by the Shemites, as before stated.

There is no other way to account for the appearance of the blacks on those islands, who have ever been acknowledged as the aboriginal or native people, other races mixing among them subsequently. This fact, also, establishes that the negro race were always as they *are*, and that those negro islanders are the descendants of the *Asiatic* Cushites, who now are cannibals, and have been thus in all time. From this same stock of black men, the Cushites of the days of Noah, descended the myriads of the negro race, found mixed through all the nations of the great eastern world, as China, the Indies, Hindostan, &c., among whom they are slaves, as in all other parts of the earth, carrying out the curse of Noah. On the continent of Africa, there is in the interior a tribe of negroes, called *Eboes*, whose features wonderfully resemble baboons, like those on the island Mallicola, particularly in the great elongation of the under jaw; these are likewise cannibals.—*Morse's Geo.*, p. 785.

Mr. Vaugill, an American, who traveled in Africa, having penetrated some way into the interior, among the *Gango* negroes, came to a pretty large settlement, where he found a kind of market place, to which the inhabitants resorted to buy and sell such things as they dealt in. Here Mr. Vaugill found an abundance of human legs and thighs, hanging on pegs driven into the trees and their huts, for sale, the same as meat is exposed in the markets of civilized countries.

In another district of Africa, called *Derwin*, situated on the shore of a river, where a schooner, commanded by one *Captain Dunninger*, had anchored for the

purpose of hunting, dwelt a tribe, or nation, of negroes, but what their name was is not recorded. At this place, a part of the crew went on shore, where there was a thick wood, in quest of game. For some reason or other, perhaps *fear*, they kept pretty near together, while they were looking about in the unknown woods, when they were suddenly set upon by a large party of negroes, concealed in the grass, and notwithstanding the guns of the schooner's party, were at once overpowered, being frightened, as the negroes rose up immediately about, and under their very feet.

They were instantly killed with clubs, except one or two, who being a little apart from the main company, fled to the vessel with the news. As soon as possible, the residue of the crew hastened to the spot, well armed, where they found nothing but the blood and entrails of the victims, for their bodies had disappeared, carried away, as they believed, to be used as food for the murderers.

A race of negroes once inhabited a large district of country, about and beyond the heads of the Nile, in Abyssinia, far south of the equator, called Giogas, who once overran a great country in Africa, in the region known as *Upper Egypt*, supporting themselves, as they went, by killing and eating the inhabitants, as they would so many cattle in an enemy's country. They finally seized upon a district which lies south of *Angolia*, bordering on the great Sahara, or sand desert, where they finally settled, and were living when the Christian missionaries found them. Whenever these people, who were the terror of the surround-

ing tribes, went out on marauding excursions to plunder and capture their own race, as has been the custom of all Africa, in all ages, they always selected from among their female slaves as many as they judged necessary for their support on their way, whom they killed as they went, for food, having used them as their wives till the time of butchering them came.—*Edinburgh Enc.*, vol. ii, p. 185.

Is it possible to conceive of any condition in human life so utterly horrible—*so far* removed from the common sympathies and moral feelings of humanity—*so* deeply damned as were this community of negroes? And yet their character was but in perfect keeping, more or less, with every horde, tribe, and nation, of the race, whether we go back to the first ages of their being in Asia and Africa, or look at them after the lapse of thousands of years, and as they are *now*, in their own untaught character, as found in the islands, woods, and mountains, of their blood-stained country.

The Rev. Mr. Brown, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Africa, related, when on a recent visit to America, some appalling accounts of cannibalism, as seen and known by himself. He related that he had seen some ten or a dozen men buy a prisoner from a tribe who had taken him in battle, and, tying his hands behind his back, fell upon him with knives, cutting off pieces of his body as the victim went, who filled the air with yells and cries for mercy, till he fell down from a loss of blood, when he was entirely devoured, except the bones. The Rev. *Barnabas Shaw*, a Wesleyan Missionary, in his Memorials of

South Africa, says—but, as we deem it, rather reluctantly—that the *Bechanan* negroes are sometimes cannibals.—*Page* 56.

That this trait of negro depravity and appetite was as much in vogue among them in the country of old Canaan, even prior to the time of Moses, and the conquest of those nations by the Hebrews, as it was in ancient Africa, or any of the adjacent islands at any time, appears from some remarks in the writings ascribed to Solomon, on this very subject. It is said of Solomon, in the Scriptures, that he was a wise man, and, of necessity, a *well read* man, or he could not have been *wise*. Solomon was, no doubt, acquainted with the history and manners of the ancient nations of the country over which he reigned, and who, in part, had been conquered by his own arms. He had access to the writings of all former ages, even those of Noah and Melchisedek, as well as of the other patriarchs. On these accounts, we may rely upon what he has said on the subject of negro cannibalism in the book of Wisdom, as set forth in the Apocrypha, chap. xii, as follows: "For it was thy will (O Lord) to destroy, by the hands of our fathers [the Hebrews], both those old inhabitants of thy holy land [Canaan], whom thou *hatest*, for doing most *odious* works of witchcrafts and wicked sacrifices, and also those merciless murderers of *children*, and *devourers* of *man's* flesh, and the feasts of *blood*, with their priests, out of the midst of their idolatrous crew, and the parents that killed, with their own *hands*, *babes* destitute of help."

Respecting these ancient nations of Canaan, the

seed of Ham, Solomon further states, in the same chapter, as above, as follows: "But executing thy judgment upon them by little and little, thou gavest them place of repentance, not being ignorant that they were a *naughty* generation, and that their malice was bred *in* them, and that their cogitation would never be changed; for it was a "*cursed seed*" from the *beginning*.

Here, allusion is made by Solomon to the *curse* of Noah, and to the decree of God against the race, in the words they were a "*cursed seed*" from the beginning, that is from the *birth* of Ham, and that their malice was bred in them. Concerning this people, Solomon further saith, in chapter 14: "Moreover, this was not enough for them that erred in the knowledge of God; but whereas they lived in great ignorance, those so great plagues called they peace. For whilst they *killed* their *children* in *sacrifice*, or used secret ceremonies, or made revellings of strange rites; they kept neither lives nor marriages any longer undefiled; but either one slew another treacherously or grieved him by adultery, so that there reigned in all men (of those nations), without exception, blood, man-slaughter, theft, dissimulation, corruption, unfaithfulness, tumults and perjury."

This account of the character of the ancient and first negroes of Canaan, as given by Solomon in the book of Wisdom, is corroborated in relation to cannibalism, by the sacred text itself, and therefore is established against them beyond all doubt. See book of Numbers, xiii, 23, where there is an account of the spies, who were sent into the mountains and

country of Canaan, to see what kind of people dwelt there; who reported of them, when they returned, that they were monsters, not only in *stature*, but in *practice*, for they said, "*they eat up the inhabitants.*" That is, they were cannibals, which frightened the spies nearly out of their wits.

The Carthaginians sacrificed infants to their gods, as well as adult persons. At *one* time, says Rollin, Vol. i, pages 255 and 272, they burnt two hundred babies, and three hundred grown persons. But whether they *eat* them after they were *roasted*, is not related by the historian. This dreadful practice they carried with them, from old Phœnicia or the land of Canaan, as the black nations of Carthage were derived from the blacks of Canaan, page 275 of the above author.

This is a dreadful picture of the ferocity of those early negro nations, who, it appears, not only worshiped the devil, practiced witchcrafts and sorcery, disregarded the marriage rites, murdered, swore false, practiced all kinds of dissimulation, but in addition to all this, they would kill and eat their own children, or any of the weaker inhabitants, the aged, the infirm, prisoners, &c.—all these they would devour as an article of food.

The times alluded to by Solomon, in the book of Wisdom, and by the book of Numbers, as above quoted, was some fifteen and nineteen hundred years B. C. Comparing these facts with the statements of Herodotus on the same subject (see below), we learn that the negro race, more or less, have always been addicted to cannibalism, from the very beginning till

the present time. The following is from the pen of Herodotus, the eldest of the Greek historians (see his work as translated, p. 170), where it is recorded respecting the *Lybian* negroes: "If any man among them appeared to be diseased, his nearest connections put him to death immediately, alledging in excuse that sickness would waste and injure his flesh. They pay no regard to his assertion, that he is not *really* ill, but without the least compunction, deprive him of his life," and then devour him when cooked.

From the time of Moses to the time of Herodotus, was a lapse of more than one thousand years. From the time of Herodotus to the time of the thirteenth century of the Christian era, when, according to Baron Humboldt and other good authorities, *cannibalism* was entirely universal in Egypt, among the negro class of the people, was a lapse of some fifteen hundred years; and from the thirteenth century to the present time, is some four hundred more; amounting in all to full three thousand years of the history of that race, in which they have been, irrespective of civilization, actually more or less in the practice of the dreadful crime of eating human flesh, as an article of food; not from necessity, nor on account of the requirements of their religion, but wholly from the common desire of that kind of food, the same as dogs or any other carnivorous animal.

It was but a few years since, 1839, that a part of the crew of the vessel *Colonel Crocket*, which sailed from Newburgh, N. Y., to Africa, was devoured by the negro cannibals, on the *Delago* river, inland about a hundred miles, while engaged on a hunting excur-

sion in the woods of that river. For all the particulars of that horrid affair, see the paper entitled "The New World," *March* 13, 1841.

On comparing the *white* nations in any, or all the ages of the earth, with the tribes, hordes, and nations of the aboriginal blacks, it is not possible, however far removed from the lights and influences of the true religion, to find such evidences of absolute mental and practical degradation, as is found over the whole earth, among the negro race, whether in a civilized or a savage state. It is impossible to find, in the history of any of the white nations, since the flood of Noah, a community who were absolutely without any knowledge of a God, of law and order, self-government, &c., as we find in all the history of the *savage* parts of the negro race. Is there on the page of universal history, whether *written* or traditionary, any account of white men going entirely naked in the woods all their lives; their women and their children having no dwellings better than a cave, a hollow tree, or a hut made of twigs, or some fragile substance; without order, laws, religion, or any kind of refinements whatever?—no knowledge of agriculture or of improvements in any way beyond a wooden spear, a bow and arrows, or some such implement? In such a condition, millions of the negro race are found in all ages of the world, as well as at the present time; but *never* the white race. Is not this fact an evidence of the radical and abiding difference there is between the races—the blacks and the whites—in relation to mind? In America, however, it is very common for some people to charge the

low and degraded condition of the negro race, to the account of the domineering manners of the whites over them; but we presume they will not do so in relation to the foregoing accounts, as the white man's influence is unknown in their ancient or modern *barbarous* condition; on this account, such persons will be compelled, even against their own *wills*, to place the *cause* to the right account—which is the negro's own natural imbecilities.

It is utterly impossible to reduce the whites by any process whatever to so low a condition, as is found to be the universal state of the negro race, on account of the possession of superior mental faculties, moral feelings, reason, reflections, sympathies, and all the train of qualifications, constituting the image of God, as alluded to, Gen. i, 27. But these qualifications, and *this image*, are possessed by the negro race in a less degree, which corresponds exactly with the difference there is between the color, forms and attitudes of the two races.

In further illustration of this fact, it is said by physicians, who have made the tropical diseases their study, that the negro sleeps sound in every disease, nor does any *mental* disturbances ever keep them awake. They bear surgical operations much better than whites; and what would be the cause of insupportable pain to a white, a negro would almost disregard. I have, says Dr. Mosely, amputated the legs of many negroes, who have held the upper part of the limb themselves, alone.—*Lawrence's Lectures*, p. 402.

And as corroboratory of this fact, we see it stated

in the speech of Dr. Browning, in the great abolition convention at London, that when he was in Egypt, a *black man*, who was a soldier, and who was wounded in the leg, found it necessary to have the limb amputated. This was done by a surgeon named *Clot Bey*, and when he expressed his surprise at not hearing any exclamation of pain, his answer was, "Do you think that a black man can bear pain no better than the white man can?"—*Pennsylvanian Freeman, August* 6, 1840.

This circumstance, however, is made use of by negro admirers as an evidence of the great fortitude of their natures, and strength of mind. But this notion is overthrown in the fact of their want of *courage* in the hour of *terror* and *danger*, and of perseverance in great undertakings. It is true that the race is *ferocious*, but ferocity is neither an evidence of courage, fortitude, nor of *mind*, but is rather a trait of their nervous *insensibility*, agreeing with the fact above stated.

The distinction of color, between white and black, is not more striking than is the difference between the *moral* feelings and *mental* endowments of the two races. They indulge almost universally in disgusting debauchery and sensuality, displaying every where a gross indifference to the mental pains and pleasures of others. Insensibility to order and metaphysical harmony, with an *entire* want of what is comprehended under the idea of elevated sentiment, manly virtue and moral feeling, is characteristic of the race; these traits and virtues attach *most* prominently to the whites, which cannot be denied by any

but fanatics, the profoundly ignorant and self-blinded character.

There are districts of country in Africa, and especially along the Atlas mountains, in which apes and baboons are so abundant, that in many of the mud hut towns of the negro natives, these animals live all together, as if they were members of the same community.—*Herne's Researches, Vol.* i, p. 37. Herodotus speaks of a tribe of negroes in Africa, who were so profoundly ignorant, that they had no names by which they could distinguish each other; their memories, respecting the *looks* of individuals, being their only guide when they met, the same as dogs after they get acquainted.

In no age, and under no circumstances, is it possible to ascertain, among any tribes, nations, or communities of the whites, so much misery and meanness, so much wretchedness and bestiality, as is found among the negroes, not of America, but of Africa, among the aboriginal people. Neither is it possible to ascertain from the page of history, under the most favoring circumstances, that the negro race have ever risen to a comparable height with the white nations in the sciences, or even in the most necessary arts.

The ancient negroes of Egypt, Ethiopia, Lybia, and Phœnicia, had no knowledge of water power, as being applicable to propel machinery, nor of machinery itself. They knew nothing of the architectural arch. They had no knowledge of the mighty principle of steam, nor of gunpowder—nothing of the magnetic needle, the clock or time-piece. They knew nothing respecting anatomy and the circulation of

the blood in the human body, or in animals. They had no knowledge of the art of printing, nor of the iron plow-share, with hundreds of implements, and manufactures now understood, and in use in the world among white nations.

Well, what of all that, says one; neither were any of these things known or understood by any body else, black or white, in those times. Granted; but how came it to pass, we ask, that, in the process of ages, the negro man, or race, has never discovered any of these things, while the white man has found out and invented them all? It is true that the Scriptures intimate that the Egyptians were a very wise people, by saying that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; Acts vii, 22. But what was this wisdom after all, but a mass of superstition and nonsense, respecting their idolatrous religion, a world of stuff, which Moses despised and rejected. Respecting their wisdom, the Jewish Rabbi hold, says Dr. Clarke, that it consisted in the arts of necromancy and magic, with which Moses, of *necessity*, was well acquainted, having been brought up in the court of Pharaoh, as heir apparent to the throne; but he condemned the whole as false wisdom and vain philosophy, derived from the heresies of the *tower*, as from a germ engendered in the polluted hearts of Ham and Nimrod, the great fathers of *negro* idolatry in the world.

In closing this section, we give the opinion of *Rollin*, as it respects the innate strength of the negro's *mind* and courage, in substance as follows: The Carthagenians had *mean* and "*groveling souls*," as

when they were victorious in battle, they were always cruel and ferocious to the prisoners; but when defeated themselves, they would *cringe* down like frightened dogs, losing all courage and hope. This was the true character of the famous Carthagenians in all their wars, and history of their existence.—*Vol.* i, p. 255.

During the first *Punic* or Phœnician war, toward the close of that contest, the Carthagenians were obliged to procure a general to lead their armies, and conduct their forces against the *Romans*, from the *Greeks*, as among themselves there were none who could cope with the victorious *Regulus*. The general they procured was the famous *Zantippus*, a Lacedemonian, who, when he had taken the command of the sooty legions, soon became the victor, even taking the Roman commander prisoner, as well as defeating his forces, when a peace between the two powers ensued.

Does this fact go to exhibit the black men of Carthage, whether woolly headed or straight haired, as being equal, in point of talent, with white men, when they were compelled to employ a *white* general, a Greek, to compete with, and conquer, the Romans at that time, or to submit to ruin?—*Whelpley's Compend of History*, p. 165.

But how did the Carthagenians requite the brave white general, for his acts of valor and friendship? By murdering him, for fear that it should be known that a white man had assisted them, and was the cause of their good fortune. This fact shows also, as *Rollin* has spoken of them, namely, that they

were mean and groveling of soul. On that famous occasion, it is said by the above historian [*vol.* i, p. 285], that when the Carthagenians saw how much superior the abilities of Zantippus were to their own generals, in manœuvering the troops in battle, they were struck with astonishment, and said that the ablest generals of Carthage knew nothing in comparison with this Greek. As to the *natural courage* (which is but another term for superior abilities) of the Roman white men, and the black Carthagenians, there was *no* comparison; as the former, though often defeated, were never discouraged; while the latter fell into despair at the very *omens* of defeat.—*Rollin, vol.* i, p. 297. This author further saith, vol. i, page 356, that whenever the Carthagenians got a victory over the Romans, their white opponents, they would *butcher*, *crucify*, and *tear* the prisoners to death; but that, on the contrary, when the Romans got a victory, they were lenient and humane. This fact, to Hannibal, was a very strange thing, which his mind could not readily comprehend. MERCY to a defeated enemy, was, to the Carthagenians, a solveless problem, while in the minds of the Romans it was a virtue of the highest order. That such dispositions as these are the innate character of the negro race, is further shown from the following: In Western Africa, it is *now* a custom of the king of *Dahomey*, *annually* to assemble all the chiefs and nobles of his kingdom, in order to aid him in the ceremony of watering the graves of his ancestors with blood. On such occasions, hundreds of human beings were butchered, consisting of prisoners, of criminals, and also of many

seized promiscuously by lawless violence from among the crowd, who suspected no evil. At any time when the king wishes to send a message to his deceased relation in another world, he delivers the errand to some one standing near, and then strikes off his head, that he may go and carry it. The roofs of the huts of this king's place of residence are ornamented all over, as are also the pavements before the doors of his huts, with the jaw bones and sculls of human beings.

In Western Africa, there is another kindom, called *Ashantee*, whose king is far more a tyrant than the king of Dahomey. When the English Commissioners, not many years since, had arrived at the capital, which was but a wilderness of low and conical huts; it was at a time when the annual *man* butchery took place, for the sake of the dead. The following is the account as published — *Universal Traveler*, page 420:

"During their stay, the Commissioners witnessed scenes so dreadful, that it seemed to sink the Ashantee character even *below* the ordinary level of savage life. The custom of human sacrifices is practiced here, on a scale still more tremendous than at Dahomey. The king had lately sacrificed, on the grave of his mother, three thousand *victims*, and at the death of the late sovereign, his predecessor, the sacrifice was continued weekly, for three months. * * * On these occasions, the *Caboceers* and princes, in order to court the royal favor, would often rush out from the presence of the king, and the first man they met they would drag to the sacrifice. While this

business lasts, it is, therefore, with trembling steps, that any one crosses the king's threshold; and when compelled to do so, they rush along with the utmost speed (as if they were passing the gates of hell), dreading every moment the murderous grasp, from which there is no escape."

Here there was a sacrifice of two thousand four hundred lives of slaves, in the short space of three months. At such a rate as that, a custom of this description would, in a century, during the reign of, say but *four* kings, allowing them an average reign of twenty-five years, destroy the lives of two hundred and forty thousand slaves, as it is the slave of the Ashantees who have thus to suffer. Is American slavery any thing like *this*, as now extant in the negro's own happy land, as abolitionists would have men believe it is?

What other people but *this* race, the Hamites, have been found on the earth since the creation of man, who are so foolish and cruel, when they have power and opportunity? Had there been no other race created on the earth, long ago the whole world would have been but one great slaughter-house, in which nc light of science, religion, government, or the useful arts, would ever have been heard of; as all these blessings are of other origin than the negro man.

As it was *then*, in the ages of Carthage, so it is *now*, and ever has been thus: the negro, when in *power*, plays the tiger, glorying in deeds of blood and terror; but when in subjection, he cringes with stupid fear, yielding his neck easily to the yoke and condition of slavery. If Hannibal was a great general, or rather

a successful one, we think we need not fear to assert that what he was, he owed to the superior talents of two white men, Lacedemonians, namely, SOBSIUS and PHILEMIUS, one of whom was his *teacher*, and the other a *counsellor*, who always attended him in his warlike expeditions.—*Rollin, vol.* i, p. 375.

There were others of the Africans, as *Masinissa* and *Juba*, kings who reigned in the interior of Africa, in the time of the Carthagenians, of whom it is said that they were great men, who, as well as Hannibal, received their education of *white* teachers—the Romans.

In conclusion, therefore, from a view of the preceding facts, we are compelled to hold that it is absolutely certain, taking the whole history of both races, the whites and blacks, into the account, that the *latter* are absolutely unequal and lower in mental abilities, and do not possess, *naturally*, the stamina of improvement as do the former; and that this difference is attributable alone to the wisdom of God, in the creation of the negro race, in the blood and being of Ham, their father; on which account it is as utterly impossible to elevate them to an equality with the whites, as it is to take away the blackness of their skins.

As sure as day is fairer to the sight
Than dreary darkness in the hour of night—
Or wood, less dazzling in the sun's bright glare,
Than Ophir's sands of gold and rubies are:
So sure it is, as sure as truth is great,
The blacks have got, than whites, a thicker pate,
But if this thought displease, as not refin'd,
We can but add, therefore—they have less mind.

TENTH SECTION.

The subject of the amalgamation of the white and negro races examined; which event, by some men, seems to be greatly desired—The voice of God, in nature, against it—Horrid results, were the amalgamation of the races to become universal—Lowering of the present standard of the powers of the human mind—Changes in the physical formation of the human body, as extant in the nations of white men, in their approximation to the form of the ourang-outang, through the influence of negro amalgamation—Deterioration of the mental image of God, as given to the keeping of the white race—Negroes' brains found to be *less* in *weight* and *measure* than the white man's—Dodging of abolitionists on this question—Anticipations of some men that amalgamation will finally become universal, so as to put down slavery in this *way*—Slavery among the African negroes before they knew white men—Stealing each other—Murdering of children among them—Many facts respecting the near approach of various negro tribes to the form of the ourang-outang—Indifference to pain, when under surgical operations—Corresponding insensibility of the mind, with respect to the *moral* feelings of the *heart*, as well as to the sufferings of others—Cruelty to the aged and the sick—Pretended obsequiousness of some abolitionists to negroes, with a view, as they say, to their exaltation—*Natural* enmity between negroes and white men.

HAVING, in the preceding section, treated on the mental inequality of the negro man, compared with white men, we shall now pass to the subject of amalgamating the two races, a thing which, in the minds of some persons, greatly to be desired, as in that way a universal equality would be made out.

That the amalgamation of the two colors, black

and white, were not designed by the Creator, is evident from the very *existence* of those two complexions. Had God been pleased to view the whole human race as possessing but *one* hue of complexion, he never would have produced more than that *one*, whether it might have been black, white, or red, or any other color, as green or blue. But if it is said that the amalgamation of the races would be proper, and not displeasing to the Supreme Being, then it will follow that he is not displeased with the overturn, subversion, and adulteration of the works of his own hands or power, and the ruin of *first* principles implanted in the *forms* and *colors* of things created.

That there should be in nature distinctions of this character is essential to order, to beauty, and classification. Without *this* trait of the Divine operations, all nature would be but one universal blot, a vast compound of sameness. The earth would have no charms. There would be no distinction of color between land and water. The green grass of the meadows and mountains, the leaves and flowers of all forests, the tints and hues of all minerals, the colors of various animals, as well as of the human race, would become blended and confused in one great chaotic mass, so far as colors are concerned, in the existence of things. Had not God, therefore, have seen that all beings of animal natures, and all substances which make out the multitudinous amount of earth's productions and inhabitants, should be distinguished for the sake of order, identification, and beauty, by a countless train of tints, hues, and colors, it would not have been thus produced.

It is, therefore, from this view, at once evident, that as God did make the two complexions of black and white originally, which characterize two races of men, that it is, therefore, no less a sin than *sacrilege* to amalgamate them, thereby destroying God's work, and supplying the ruin with adulterations. But when it is considered that there are connected with those two complexions, two races of men differing as much in their *mental* faculties as they do in color and formation, and that these mental faculties, colors and formations, depend, for their *continuance*, upon the preservation of their respective attributes in those particulars, it furnishes a mighty reason why the whites and blacks should not mingle races, and thereby *sin* against God in the mutilation of the original order.

If by amalgating the two races, the native intellectuality of the whites becomes deteriorated, the reason why so monstrous an innovation on the rights of God should not be committed, is still more glaring. Is it wise, for the sake of elevating the negro race, to make so great a sacrifice as the destruction of the white man from the earth? If so, let them amalgamate, the road is open and broad. Against such a course, on the part of the African, we have heard of no objections, and but little from abolitionists.

Were the races universally, by amalgamation, to mingle, the effect would be the destruction to both colors, the black and white, and a new one, which God never created, take the place of the others, and this would be a dingy yellow, called the *Mulatto*. The present heaven-approved form and complexion

of the white race would be handed to posterity, through the dark medium of negro blood, stained, obscured and confused. Their complexion would be but half white, the covering of their heads neither wool nor hair, their noses flattened and made wider, their mouths vastly extended, the temples narrowed and sunken, the forehead lowered and slanted backward, the *contour* of the head elongated, monkey like, the eyes eclipsed of intelligence and made glossy like the eyes of animals, the under jaw protruded, the teeth set laterally, the waist narrowed, the chest widened, the posteriors pointed and lifted up, the foot enlarged and made spongy on the outer sides, the heel set backward, the calf of the leg taken away, the shin bone made convex, the skull thickened, the lips pouted forward, the cheek bones lifted up, and the whole external of the progeny become changed, and merged in Egyptian darkness. But the above changes are not all the horrors which amalgamation produces; as the passions and mental faculties become remodeled and changed to other characters, as presented in the *mulatto* race of negroes.

There is an increased disposition to untameable and unrestrained lewdness, to treachery, to insensibility of feeling, to a want of high and manly sentiment. There is seen in this character, as in the real black, a proneness to loud and senseless laughter, an extraordinary desire to whistle and sing, especially when in circumstances of labor and servitude. The fancies of the mind undergo a change also, in relation to colors, as the negro's eye is powerfully attracted by the *red* and yellow, in the decorations of their

bodies. The powers of appetite are also increased, so that several kinds of food, abhorrent to a white man's palate, comes not amiss, as is seen among the wild people of Africa, whether black, brown or yellow The feeling of love for children, in the light of a desire of their mental improvement, as is manifested by the white race, in a great measure, ceases to exist, and in its place springs up a happy indifference on this important matter. All *this*, and much more than we have words to express, as seen in the whole negro character, would be the fearful result of lowering the standard of the human mind, as now possessed by the whites, by amalgamating the blood of the races. That such would be the consequence is as sure as is cause and effect; for it is a physiological fact, that the *brain* of all negroes is less in *size* and weight than the brain of white men by more than one-eighth. This is known by actual examinations of the heads of the two races.—*See Bingham on the Brain, p.* 21.

In connection with this appalling truth, it is found also that the arms of the negro race are longer than the arms of the whites, holding a midway relation between white men and monkeys in this particular. This was found to be so by Dr. White, who measured the arms of nearly fifty negro skeletons, and in all cases were found to have longer arms than whites of the same height of person.—*See Lawrence's Lectures on the History of Man, p.* 350.

The whole character of the flesh of the negro race, as well as their nerves, seems to be of a coarser character, less fine and delicate than is the flesh and

nerves of the white race. The skin of their bodies is thicker and heavier than is the whites, especially about the head. Respecting the females of the African race, it is said that their breasts grow to monstrous sizes, hanging down even below their waists.—*Lawrence's Lectures, p.* 359. This would be a beautiful trait of symmetry to be added to the female portion of the whites, were the amalgamation of the races to become universal.

It is said, by those skilled in surgical operations and dissections of the human body, that the flesh of negroes, from the outside to the bone, is of a darker color, as well as the blood, than the flesh and blood of white men. And why should not this be so, as the character, or animal, if we may so speak, is wholly a different creature from the white human animal? In relation to the lower orders of animals, is it not true that there is a great difference in the texture and nature of their *flesh* in many particulars? This is known to the most unobserving, and why should it be wondered at, when we assert that the same rule or circumstance exists between white men and negroes, and quite as much as their looks indicate.

Amalgamation with them, therefore, proposes not only the blackening of the skin, but of the blood and flesh, even to the bone, as well as the deterioration of the mental faculties of the progeny of the whites. It is stated by *Herodotus*, that the very *semen* of the African negro, in *his* time, was *black*, which is equally true at the present—or at *least* it is of a dark blueish tinge, of which any man may convince himself,

if he is deeply desirous of physiological information. Would not such a course be a species of *blasphemy*, by despising the image of God, which is *intellectual ity*, given to the keeping of the white race, *more* than to the blacks? To cast away, therefore, any portion of this image or likeness of God, would be a deed too horrible for contemplation.

Any mingling of the blood of the blacks with the whites, is considered by Professor Lawrence, a deterioration of the mental powers of the progeny produced. But, says one (an admirer of the negro race), it has never entered the heart of abolitionism to justify or aid in the actual amalgamation of the two races; we have only plead for, aided and abetted the doctrine of, the negroes' natural and perfect equality with white men, as to their right to freedom and equality, with regard to slavery, their mental faculties and claim of political elevation in human society.

Very well, this you have done, as all the world knows. But what is the tendency of such a doctrine? Is it not the high road to amalgamation? If the negro race in Christendom, are elevated to a parallel politically with white men, will they not, therefore, with this elevation (were it to be effected), become eligible to political offices; and thus establish the *principle* on which the election of negro magistrates, judges, legislators and governors, with any and all the offices of the civilized world, could be effected? Let this principle of political equality become once established in relation to the blacks, would not the odium of marriages between the races be greatly lessened? Would not facilities be afforded

to the negro race of mingling on equal terms with the whites, in relation to *all* the immunities of society? If so, then would there not be removed out of the way, in the estimation of millions, one great obstacle to amalgamation by marriages between the races? What propriety, therefore, is there in the pretense of some abolitionists, that they by no *means* plead for amalgamation, while they approve of principles and acts, which have for their *certain* result, the amalgamation of black and white, in one great and common community.

But as dreadful as is the contemplation of such a state of human society, there are thousands in the United States, who, in the fierceness of their zeal, for the negroes' *mere* liberty, would happily forego the loss of half their mental powers, and their white complexion to boot, if they could but bring about this famous equality, and thus make an end of slavery.

In various conversations which the writer has had with violent abolitionists, we have inquired of them, whether, in order to carry out their belief of the negroes' absolute equality with white men, they were willing that a son or a daughter of theirs, should be united with them in marriage? To this question, we could seldom receive a direct answer, either *yes* or *no*, but were generally met by equivocation, as follows: "Pray, sir, is there any *law*, human or divine, against such marriages?"

Here we would urge all the dissimilarities of the two races, in their faculties, passions, appetites, formation, color, looks, and *smell:* again repeating the

question—would you be willing that a son or a daughter of yours should marry a negro?—but receiving almost always the same shuffling reply. By this course of theirs, we became, as often as conversation of the kind occurred, convinced that these very persons abhorred the unnatural connection; and yet they would not yield the point, for fear of being compelled to acknowledge their real belief in the fact of their absolute inferiority. Yes, we have often heard abolitionists remark, that the time will come, when all mankind will be of one color, and that will be the yellow or brown, as that the good work of amalgamation of negroes and white men, was going rapidly on in the world; and this they said with a kind of joyful anticipation, as if by that means, negro slavery would at last be abolished in the world. Thus it is evident, that when a man, or party of men, become firmly seated on a *hobby horse*, its speed is never known to slack, till the ruin of horse and rider is effected. But although abolitionists affect to deny that they are favorable to an amalgamation of the whites and blacks, this is contradicted in the speech of *Wendell Phillips*, in the great London Abolition Convention, as follows: "When he went to America, and told them that he had seen the *white* man and *black* man walk arm in arm, he should not be believed. He wished to have it recorded by the British press, that the colored man was to be received in the *same* manner as the white."—*Pennsylvania Freeman, August* 6, 1840, No. 204.

The doctrine is also approved of by Dr. Browning, who was a member of the London Abolition Conven-

tion; see his speech in the "Pennsylvania Freeman," *August* 6, 1840, No. 204, as follows: "There was *one* circumstance (he said) connected with the East (meaning the Mohammedan countries), that was *peculiarly* interesting, and that was, that there they knew of no distinction of color; they had no nobility of *skin*. White men, of the highest rank, married *black women*, and black men frequently occupied the highest social and official situations."

Oh, how happy a thing it would be, in the estimation of this man, would the Americans only pattern after the Mohammedan, in this thing, and thus confound the two colors, black and white, and sin against God, who made the difference, not to be mingled, but to be forever separate.

But as to the abolishment of negro slavery on such grounds as that, it can never be accomplished; for the history of the negro nations, from the earliest ages down to the present time, furnishes abundant proof that they have enslaved their own race as much, and *far* more cruelly, than either of the other races, the red man or the white.

To prove this, we adduce the following on that point: STRABO, an ancient historian, says that the Egyptians worked the machinery by which the waters of the Nile were elevated, in time of drought, to irrigate their lands, by slaves instead of oxen. To each of such machines, there were attached one hundred and fifty slaves of their own color.—*Rollin, vol.* i, p. 133.

The Carthagenians, a negro people in Africa, who at first were a colony from Phœnicia, or old Canaan.

had vast hordes of slaves of their own color, whom they not only compelled to do their labor, but also, in great numbers, sacrificed them annually to their gods as burnt offerings.—*Rollin, vol.* i, p. 223. HANNO, an opulent citizen of Carthage, though a black man himself, had twenty thousand slaves, by which means, at one time, he attempted to usurp the government of his country, but was killed in the attempt. *Rollin, vol.* i, p. 266.

But, in later times, we find, among the negro tribes of Africa, the same practice. *Damberger*, the German traveler, in Africa, says, vol. ii, pages 151 and 152, that the kings or great chiefs of the tribe called Ba-ha-ras, who lived on the river Gambia, or Niger, had his subjects in such a condition of vassalage, that he sold them as slaves, whenever he would, not only victims taken in war, but of his own tribe and countrymen.

Another nation he passed through, called *Haouffas*, who always sold their children, when young, to other tribes, in order to avoid the trouble of taking care of them in their infancy, and then supplied their place by stealing such as were grown larger, to prevent their own tribe from running out.—*Damberger, vol.* ii, p. 158. The king of the same tribe above named, practiced selling all his wives for slaves, at such times as he became weary of their company, obtaining new ones from among his own subjects, whether already the wives of other men or not.

One tribe he found, who killed all their female children, but saved the males, stealing their wives from other tribes, or taking them in battle. This

tribe were called Kan-torrians, and inhabited a tract of country on the river *Tumba*, north of the Caffrees or Hottentot region.—*Damberger, vol.* i, p. 150. This author further states, vol. i, p. 173, in a note, that all the tribes he fell in with, except the Caffrees, dealt in slaves among themselves.

These slaves they acquired in their wars, not instigated by white men, but by themselves, as they are seldom at peace with each other, and have not been in all past ages. Professor Russell says, p. 44, of his work, that *one* of the chiefs of lower *Nubia*, living at a place called Derr, had an army of three thousand natives, *all slaves*, procured from the slave dealers of Dongola, a tribe dwelling further in the interior than the Nubians, above named. With these, this tiger-man ravaged and plundered distant tribes, killing and capturing all who came in his way. *Derr*, his place of residence, was considered the capital of lower Nubia, consisting, as to its architecture, of vast numbers of *mud* huts, in which dwelt the slaves of this horrible negro king, rolling naked in mud when it rained, and in dust, ashes, and creeping things, when it was dry. M. CAILBE, in 1824, made a hazardous journey to the famous negro city, *Timbucto*, quite in the central part of Africa, who says that the people are negroes of the *Kissour* tribe, and that their chiefs have all their work done by slaves, who are compelled to live *separate* from their masters, though they are all of one color, and one kind of people. This famous city is also but a straggling, disorderly mass of mud huts and dried grass, filled to overflowing with wretched, naked

men and women.—*Family Magazine, pages* 82 *and* 83.

Why *naked* roam, thou negro man, in Afric's horrid wild,
O'er mountains high, and valleys deep, like a poor homeless child?
The beasts that dwell amid the woods, are happier far than you—
For they have *coats* of fur and hair, to guard from rain and dew.
Your soil gives forth the *native flax*, and other means of dress—
Why roam, like troops of monkeys wild, o'er all the wilderness?
Is not your land both deep and rich, to yield each year anew
The annual crop, would you but *plant*, as other nations do?
Why dwell in huts of grass and mud, and caves, and hollow trees,
Drench'd by the rains in summer times, and in the winter freeze?
Is there not stone and rock, and forests deep and green,
From which good houses you might build, your naked limbs to screen?
Your mountains give the min'ral beds of iron and steel their birth,
Of which the plow and axe are made, to cultivate the earth.
The diamond sparkles on your hills, their depths yield golden ore,
By which mankind enrich themselves, and generate all power.
Why roam, therefore, thou negro man, like beasts of blood and prey,
Naked and starv'd, no house or home, like a lost child astray?
Ah, mighty white man, ask thou *this*—poor negro have no trade;
He sees no *flax*, no *stone*, or tree, from which such things are made!
He does not know that gold and trade, with labor infinite,
Has brush'd away from nature's face the gloom of ancient night.
His pate is thick, his brain is small, deep buried up in wool—
He does not *know*, as white men do, but lives and dies a fool.
Oh, white man, take us from ourselves, our huts, our holes, our caves!
Oh, feed and clothe us, teach us too, and we will be your slaves!
For thus it was from earliest time, as we have heard decreed,
That Ham should serve all other men, and never can be freed.
Gen. ix, 25; Joshua ix, 23.

There was a missionary, who recently lived in West Africa, at a place called Monrovia, namely, *Dr. Goheen*, who has published to the world, in a paper entitled *Liberator*, that slavery in the United States, in its *worst* form, even under the lash, is not as bad as slavery is in Africa. He says, it is a well known truth, that *nine-tenths* of the population are in a state of personal slavery. The females are sold at an early age, to be, as soon as grown up, beasts of burden, or wives, as their negro owners may require. The kings and chiefs of that country, he says, drive their own people in droves to the sea, where they sell their own blood and color by thousands, to whosoever

will buy them. Thus it has always been in Africa, ages before the European white man knew any thing about the slave trade. Even the famous, and partially civilized, Carthagenians used to obtain vast numbers of slaves from a region of country in Africa, inhabited by a people called *Goromantes*, a powerful tribe of the interior, who made it their chief business to catch the people of their own color, to sell to the Carthagenians.—*Herne's Researches in Africa, vol.* ii, p. 231. This was done ages before the era of Christianity, and, of necessity, could not have been instigated by European white men.

CRAWFORD, in his Indian Archipelago, vol. i, pages 18–20, states, that there are, in those islands, two races of blacks. One of those races is not as black as the other, and have straight or long hair, while the other race is of a jet black, with *woolly* heads. The straight haired race, he says, hold the woolly heads in the utmost contempt, making slaves of them wherever they can be caught. The woolly heads are constantly found in a savage and more wild condition than the other race, making no improvements, but cleaving entirely to a state of nature, going naked, and living wholly on the produce of the wilderness. Thus it is made clear, in the above facts, that though all mankind were tinged by the negro blood, as some abolitionists desire, yet would not slavery be abolished, as the negro man has ever been found as ready to enslave his own race as are the other nations of the earth, no matter whether in a civilized or a barbarous state. This is the people—the woolly heads of Africa, the most degraded of the human race, who

are even thus esteemed by the brown kind of negroes, having straight hair, in the same countries—that abolitionists desire to elevate, politically, to an equality with white men, and, of necessity, to become amalgamated with them, by fellowship in marriages, and the other immunities of white society. The negro race do not, and never were possessed of the common sympathies of human nature for their fellows in trouble, but treat such circumstances as a thing of no account. It is a well known fact, that when a slave is punished for a misdemeanor, and cries out under the operation, it excites laughter among them, instead of tears. They are not a race of people of sufficient sympathies or feeling to care much about their own sufferings, or their condition of slavery, as a great whole, beyond their own individual being, and, in millions of cases, not even then—thinking nothing of the odium of being a slave, so long as comfort and protection is in their individual pessession. Was not this trait of their character exemplified in the two slaves of the Hon. Henry Clay, when on a trip to Canada, some few years since? While there, the two slaves were told by the people, that, as they were on English ground, they were *free*, and were urged with great vehemence to avail themselves of the happy circumstance in their favor, but to no purpose. The blacks replied, that they loved their *master*, and would not leave him, and actually returned with him to the south, and to their condition of servitude again. Many such instances have taken place.

This principle of indifference to the happiness of their fellows, is shown, not only in the history of the

cruelties practiced in Africa, by the chiefs, upon the slaves, but also by the cruelties of the southern slaves toward each other, as manifested by the actions of the negro slave drivers. In such cases as when an owner of slaves happens to advance some more active and intelligent negro to overlook the labors of a gang, the whip is seen to be in lively exercise, as well as the tongue. This is passing strange!

In further proof of this indifference of the blacks, respecting human suffering, we quote the following from *Barnabas Shaw's* Memorials of South Africa, published at the Methodist Episcopal book-room, in New-York, 1841. This author states, page 37, that the *Namacqua* negroes always leave their *aged* parents and the sick to fall a prey to the wild beasts, or to die of hunger, whenever they remove from one habitation to another. This tribe is a branch of the *Hottentot* family, who are descended, as is believed, from the ancient Egyptians. The *bushman* negroes are guilty of dreadful acts of cruelty toward each other, when in a *helpless* condition. They have no feelings, says Mr. *Shaw*, pages 42, 43, 56, toward babes, the sick, or their own aged parents, making even a boast of it. They will kill their children on the most trifling occasion, if not shaped to suit them. If pursued by an enemy, they will kill the aged: or if very hungry, they will eat human flesh. The *Caffree* negroes of that country, he says, page 53, carry their sick into the woods to die alone, or to be devoured by serpents, wild beasts, or cast into some pit or hole, unheeded and forsaken. MOTHERS, one would think, would love and protect their babes, as even this vir-

tue is found instinctively possessed even by dumb beasts; and yet we are told by Mr. Shaw, in his work, p. 56, that a woman of the *Bechuan* tribe, offered to sell her child to him for some glass beads, who said that she loved her child, but that she loved beads far better. On the least occasion, says Mr. Shaw, page 58, they will kill their wives as they would a troublesome dog.

Insensibility to pain, remarks this author, p. 61, is one of the negro *faculties;* as they seem not to feel when even cut to pieces, nor do they care for their fellows when seen in the greatest distress.

With a view to all these things, and many more disgusting particulars, which the reader's discernment will not fail to suggest, how is it possible that any white man on the face of the earth can be found, who in his heart is willing to have the races become one by amalgamation? To the writer, such a desire seems to be a kind of monstrosity, a hideous nightmare, a frightful incubus, chattering and grinning on the bosom of the soul, driven on, and on, as by a devil in mockery, for the crime of believing in, and desiring the union of, white blood with black.

There are not wanting under this baleful influence, cases in the land, even among the refined and opulent, who have lent and are lending their influence to the *ultra* objects of abolitionism; and also, who have bowed down themselves in the sight of the Heavens and the earth, to the very dust, in compliance to negroes, desiring thereby to have it believed that they do most heartily espouse the notion of the black men's intellectual equality with themselves.

And then, with effrontery enough to look a tiger out of countenance, have braved the common and popular indignation, forming a mighty contrast between their apparent humility and lowly deference of the negro, and their dauntless impudence toward those who cannot, for the sake of the image of God, subscribe to this blasphemy against nature.

We are acquainted with occurrences of this description, when a negro man has been petted, caressed, and almost seemingly adored, by proud, scornful and aristocratic white men, who, taking the negro by the arm with affected politeness and attention, have led and escorted the black to the best seat in a superb carriage, and from thence in pomp and array, to a place of public entertainment. Yes, we have understood, that, in the city of New York, there was a certain opulent gentleman, who, under the frightful influence of the negro abolition *mania*, went so far with the horrible phrenzy, as to force negroes upon the notice and attention of his daughters, in his own house, and thus insult his own blood, and that of the whole white part of creation.

Can such doings be sincere? We have no confidence in the sincerity of such professions. The very pretenders feel appalled at heart, and loathe the unnatural approximation; yes, the very negroes themselves know better, and laugh at the hypocrisy and nonsense of the whole farago; but, nevertheless, they are willing to be petted, as long as the conspirators against the order of God in the creation may be under the influence of this extraordinary political spasm, which will endure just as long and

no longer, than when their political object is attained or lost.

If, indeed, the negro race are worthy the attention bestowed upon them at the present time, how is it that they do not put forth the arm of mental power, and convince mankind that their abolition friends are worthily bestowing their energies for their benefit? How is it that the people and government of San Domingo, who are now free and politically independent, have never petitioned the different governments of Christendom, who have slaves, for the elevation of their race by education? How is it that they, who were able to massacre their masters, and to plunder their houses, ravish their wives and daughters, and to riot till glutted in rapine and plunder, have not poured out their eloquence on the ear of mankind, arising out of the rich fund of their mental powers, and wrought upon their sympathies, deluged the world with arguments, heaped up like mountains in favor of the negro race—thus putting the nations and countries to the blush at the thought of enslaving a people *so* high minded and patriotic, *so* noble and pure in principle, a race possessed of the sweetest and liveliest moral powers and feeling, each man of them longing and desiring the improvement of his people more, far more, than his own individual happiness? But this they have not done, and we have doubts whether they even care much about it, in the *patriotic* sense of the word. Nay, the very papers which are published in America for their especial advancement, are, in a great measure, if not wholly, got up and supported by white men. How is this?

If they are a race of oppressed human beings, who are worthy of a better fate, and are grieving and struggling to rise to common equality, how is it that the whole labor of the attempt is exerted by another race of people than themselves?

Were the negro population of the southern states of the Union elevated to political equality with white men, and the doctrine of amalgamation allowed, which would be the certain consequence of such equality, would such a change in their favor secure contentment? our answer is, *no*, it would not, except they could have the exclusive rule. In their very being the God of nature has raised up a barrier between the two races, which cannot be passed without incurring consequences of the most revolting character.

To set the negroes free in all America, and to bestow upon them political equality, while, at the same time amalgamation should be penally resisted by death or perpetual imprisonment to both parties, there would arise out of such a state of the case all the horrors of hatred and confusion, violence and assassinations, that can be conceived of. There is a natural dislike of the races toward each other, on which account, were the negroes made politically free, without the privilege of intermarrying with the whites, there would soon arise quarrels and discontent; as the possession of mere political liberty, without all the other immunities of white society, would not and could not satisfy them. Nothing short of the most intense attention could prevent jealousies on their part; nor even *this*, as the knowledge of their own inferiority

would always promote that passion, even where, on the part of the white man, there should be no intention to grieve or to give causes of discontent. The races are two kinds of men, constituted entirely different, in both body and soul; on which account there can be no union or fellowship between the two, on the ground of common equality, except by amalgamation; which would be, were such a thing to come to pass, a universal retrograde from the moral image of God toward the condition of brutes; inasmuch as that the intellectuality of the white race would be destroyed from off the earth, and merged in the thick skulls of the negroes.

There has been, from the earliest time, a decided dislike existing between the two races, so much so, that the fact has not escaped the notice of the ancient historian. Between the Romans and Carthagenians there was eternal hatred and war; and it is the same at the present time in *feeling* every where, as the negro knows his own inferiority, and therefore hates, in his heart, the white man, because of the difference, and wishes to have the *upper* hand.

There is but one way to settle this great difficulty between the races, which is, to make the whole family of man, of but one color, as it was at *first*, and of but one general character, as to intellect. But thus God has not seen fit to do, in relation to this matter; he, therefore, who goes about to mix and confound that which God has set apart by an indellible *mark*, is a disorganizer and is worthy of transportation from this earth to some place without the pale of the *universe*, where he could cogitate

alone the beauties of negro amalgamation with the blood of white men.

As when a black'ning cloud obscures the light,
And turns the beauteous day half way to night—
Or as some *devil's hand* on ruin set,
Should dip all flowers in a dye of jet:
'Twould be like him who pleads, oh, foul disgrace,
To stain with *negro* blood the white man's face!
And worse than this, *more* drear, *more* hell-refined,
He'd sink in darkness deep the moral mind—
And say *all* bloods are equal, all, all *one* state,
And thus would mingle that which God did separate.
Would with Japhet's *blessing* of the great "*I am*,"
Imbue, confound and mix, the *curse* of Ham.

ELEVENTH SECTION.

Inquiries whether the statements of Noah, respecting the race of Japheth, or the white nations, enslaving the descendants of Ham, have been fulfilled, and are now in progress to that effect—Number of the sons of Japheth—Their great power—Countries they settled at first—Nations now known of that progeny—First cities built by them, which was earlier than any of the others—Description of the first operations of men near Ararat, during Noah's life-time after the flood—Respecting Melchisedek, who he was, which is in connection with the subject—Travels of Shem among the first settlements—Worship of *Baal*, or the fly god, now among the Africans—Nimrod and the wild beasts, with a plate—*Shem*, the son of Noah, was Melchisedek—Sidons, the first city of mankind after the flood, built by the whites—First instances on a great scale of white men enslaving the race of Ham in *ancient* times, and respecting its continuance—Certainty of the fulfillment of God's decrees, and the veracity of the Scriptures—Strictures on the opinions of abolitionists—Their opposition to the Bible if it upholds slavery—Views of St. Paul respecting negro slavery, as set forth in the New Testament—Vast Numbers of slaves in the Roman empire in St. Paul's time—Their dreadful condition—Curious opinion of abolitionists, as a reason why Christ did not reprove slavery—Nimrod and the tower, with other matters.

Having in the previous and last section, treated on some of the horrors of amalgamating the white and black races, we come now to inquire whether the prophecy of Noah, commonly called the *curse* of Noah, upon Ham and his progeny, has been fulfilled, in relation to the part *Japheth* and his race were to perform toward enslaving them, as well as the part *Shem* and *his* progeny were to accomplish, in fulfill-

ment of the same thing. That such an event was to take place, is as certainly specified in that decree, as that the race of *Shem* should in part fulfill it, as is seen they did, during the whole history of the Hebrew race, and are now fulfilling it, in all parts of the earth, where the descendants of *Shem* and *Ham* are found. It should be recollected that *Japheth's* race had nothing to do in the conquest of the great negro country called Canaan, Phœnicia, Palestine, or the Holy Land. Those wars were carried on wholly by the Jews, continuing from the days of Moses, to the time Judea became a part of the Roman empire, but a little while before Christ.

During all these ages, the progeny of *Japheth* were peopling the regions of the north around the Caspian and Black Seas, Georgia, Circassia, Astracan, Tartary, &c., north, and west and northwest, now called the countries of Europe: as Turkey, Austria, Prussia, Russia, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Germany, and the islands of the north Atlantic; the Divine Providence reserving the *later* ages, for the fulfillment of that part of his decree, which was to be performed by Japheth toward the race of Ham.

JAPHETH, the great ancestor of all the white nations of the earth, was the father of *seven* sons, whose names, according to 1 Chron., 1st chap., and Josephus's Antiquities of the Jews, were Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech and Tiras; all of whom had also many sons, who, branching off in their several posterities in the regions above named, became the heads of a multitude of nations of white men, and, in the course of time, of multitudes of

languages. Moses gives the same account as above, Gen. x., from the 1st to the 5th verse inclusive, and adds, that by these the descendants of *Japheth* "were the isles of the *Gentiles* (or *Japhethites*), divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations."

From GOMER, the first son, came the ancient Gomerites or Galatians, to whom St. Paul wrote two of his epistles, a people dwelling far north of Judea, about the Euxine Sea, on the very eastern borders of Europe.

From MAGOG, the second son, came the Magogites, whom the Greeks in their histories of the nations coeval with themselves, call Scythians or leather dressers, whose region of country was along the borders of Tartary, including Bucharia, and probably Tartary itself, who were the great ancestors of many of the white nations of Europe and America.

From MADAI and JAVAN, the third and fourth sons, came the Medes and Persians, of ancient times, whose country lay between the Gulf of Persia and the Caspian Sea, as well as further east.

From TUBAL, the fifth son, came the Tubalites, Iberians or Celts, ancestors of several of the nations of Europe also, as the French, Italians, Spanish and Portugese, and the early Greeks of the Archipelago.

From MESHECH, the sixth son, came the Capadocians, or ancient Germans and Russians, with all that variety of nations and languages.

From TIRAS, the seventh son, came the ancient Thracians, whose places of settlements were about the western and northern coasts and islands of the

Mediterranean. All these nations, however, in the earliest time, and much more in succeeding ages, especially in the regions of Europe, were mingled by amalgamation, as was right and natural, being all the descendants of the same ancestor, Japheth, a son of Noah.

One of their great cities, that is of the *Thracians*, was the famous *Troy*, which, in the time of David, B. C. 1100, was in its glory, and stood inland from the Mediterranean about twelve miles north, on a rising ground, and in that age was the capital of their country. The latitude of ancient Troy, or Troja, was 40° north, and longitude 16°, more than a thousand miles west of Turkey, on the promontory of Italy, near where Rome was afterward built. Here it was that *Dardanus*, one of the immedite descendants of *Tiras*, the seventh son of *Japheth*, the grand-son of *Noah*, founded the city of Troy, which at first was called Dardania, as Dardanus was its first king. Afterward it was called Troja, or Troy, from Tros, the grand-son of Dardanus. After this it was called *Ilium*, from *Ilus*, the son of *Tros*.

This region was among the earliest settlements of the sons of Japheth, and especially of that branch who were the ancestors of the ancient Greeks, who had migrated westward from the sources of the Euphrates, in the region of the Black Sea, where the ark rested, quite to the northern coast of the Mediterranean in the country of Italy, so called from the word Ilium, the name of ancient Troy. From this branch of the house of Japheth, by the lineage of Tiras, descended also the *Latins*, the progenitors

of the ancient Romans, whose history is well known to the world.

Thus we see, how immense were the countries of the white race, as well as the greatness of their power. Alexander the Great was a Greek, and a white man, who conquered, as it is said, the world, and wept because there was nothing more to conquer.

By this view, we see that God carried forward, in the very first ages, the fortunes of Japheth, in that of his race, to great power, as he had said by the mouth of Noah should be accomplished; which was, that he would *enlarge* Japheth, until he should dwell in the tents of *Shem*, and hold the descendants of Ham as slaves (Gen. ix, 27, where both these events are foretold and *decreed*).

But, before we proceed further to show the fulfillment of Noah's prophesy, in relation to Ham's race being enslaved by the whites of Japheth's progeny, and of his dwelling in the tents or countries of *Shem*, we shall indulge our pen in giving some probable account of Noah and Shem, *after* the annunciation of the decrees respecting all Noah's sons during their lives. There can be no doubt but Noah remained where he first settled, after leaving the place of the resting of the ark, on account of his great age, and the improvements made there on his first plantation, by the aid of his sons and grandsons, before they began to leave the paternal home, for the sake of their respective families.

That Noah became a farmer, is shown by a remark of Moses, Gen. ix, 20, who there says that Noah began to be a husbandman. Here it was, not far from

the eastern end of the Black Sea, in latitude 40° north, and longitude 40° east, being about three thousand miles from the island of England, in a south-easterly direction, that Noah dwelt. Were one to go from England to the south-eastern end of the Black Sea, he would pass, in following a straight line from London, through the straits of Dover, and the countries of Brussel, Germany, Austria, Turkey, and nearly the whole length of the Black Sea, before he would arrive at the region of country where Noah lived after the flood. Here it was that his children, and children's children, even to the tenth generation, visited him during the three hundred and fifty years that he lived, after the flood; as it was at this place that an altar to the living God was erected, to which that part of his children, the descendants of Shem and Japheth, resorted, who adhered to the religion of Noah, while Ham and his race turned recreant and followed the idolatry of Nimrod.

Among the foremost of the sons of Noah, was Shem, who attained to such a height of religious purity, that he became, not only by the Divine sanction as well as by his birthright, God's only *high-priest*, in those ages, consisting of five hundred years; from whose lips the primitive people received a knowledge of the true religion; who, spreading out in all directions in process of time, over the whole world, carried with them this knowledge, out of which has arisen all the various ideas of *supernatural* religion which now prevail over the globe, but distorted and foreign to the original truth.

We have said above, that *Shem*, the son of Noah,

became God's high-priest, for it was Shem who was the real Melchisedek, the righteous king of Salem, who is spoken of by Moses, Gen. xiv; by David, Psalms cx, 4, and by St. Paul, Hebrews vii, 1. This man, the son of Noah, *Shem* by *name*, and *Melchisedek* by *appellation*, was, of all men who have lived since the flood, the best qualified to instruct the people of those first ages, during the five hundred years of his life after the flood. As he was born more than a hundred years before the flood, he must have acquired a vast amount of antediluvian knowledge, as well as unbounded influence among the then young tribes and nations, of that part of the world, after the flood. He could tell them all about the institutions, arts, agriculture, commerce, science, and the extent of the antediluvian population; with every particular respecting the location of the garden of paradise, the *tree* of life, the tree of knowledge, the creature called the serpent; the size and stature of Adam, and of men in general; the forerunners, or supernatural signs, of the flood; the opinions of the people about it, and respecting his father's building the ark; where the ark was built, and what course it was borne on the waters; the *circumstance* of Enoch's translation; what the promise of the *seed* of the woman meant; his opinion of the Messiah, as well as of the power which caused the serpent to speak, and use *articulate* sounds, or language; and whether Adam, as Jewish tradition relates, prophesied of the ruin of the world by *water* first, and then by *fire* at last; with thousands of other amazingly interesting matters.

Shem, or Melchisedek, over-lived his father Noah

one hundred and fifty years; and the patriarch Abraham, nearly fifty; and, of consequence, was acquainted with Isaac, the son of Abraham. From this man all the patriarchs, from Arphaxad down to Isaac, comprehending five hundred years, received a knowledge of the true God, and the religion of Adam, Seth, Enoch, and all the patriarchs before the flood, down to Isaac, from whom Jacob, the son of Isaac, derived the same, and transmitted it to the twelve tribes of the Jews, his sons.

Noah was acquainted, and was contemporary, with Abraham sixty-four years before he, with his father, *Terah*, left the country of *Ur*, in Chaldea, east of the Euphrates, and went to *Haran*, in Canaan, the country of the Hamites. He was also contemporary with all the patriarchs born between the flood and the time Abraham was sixty-four years old; which was ten generations. He was contemporary with *Arphaxad*, the son of Shem, and his family—with *Salah*, the son of Arphaxad, and his family—with *Eber*, the son of Salah, and his family—with *Peleg*, the son of Eber, and his family—with *Reu*, the son of Peleg, and his family—with *Serug*, the son of Reu, and his family—with *Nahor*, the son of Serug, and his family—with *Terah*, the son of Nahor, and his family—with *Abraham*, the son of Terah, and his family—before his marriage with Sarah, while Katura, the first wife of Abraham, was alive, and probably until his marriage with his last wife, Sarah. Thus Noah reached the sixty-fourth year of Abraham's life, three hundred and fifty years after the flood.

But Shem goes on with the acquaintance of his

house, Japheth's and Ham's, one hundred and fifty years further down the course of time, over-living Abraham, and reaching to nearly fifty years of the life of Isaac, and nearly, or quite, down to the birth of Jacob and Esau; for Isaac was married to Rebecca, ten years before the death of Shem, or Melchisedek.

But, says one, could Noah and Shem visit so many thousands and tens of thousands of their progeny, in order to become acquainted with those early tribes of men, and communicate to them useful knowledge, such as we have alluded to above? The answer is, they could not, nor was there any necessity of such a thing; as there was a much easier way, and this was, that all the patriarchs of those ages, and their children, would, and no doubt did, out of love and respect to Noah, as well as out of love to the first altar raised to the worship of God, where his voice had been heard audibly, blessing Noah and his house. Gen. ix. The ark and this altar, as well as the person of Noah, would, and no doubt did, attract some out of love, and thousands out of curiosity, to visit so noted a place, and so great a man as was Melchisedek, the priest of the house of Noah, and the first races of men after the flood. On these accounts, there can be no doubt but the residence of Noah was the grand resort of all his progeny, except Ham's, during those ages, till his death; and of caravan after caravan from every direction, consisting of camels, dromedaries, horses, asses, elephants and oxen, laden with riders, food for themselves on the way, and gifts for Noah and the altar, over which the princely Shem presided, as the high-priest of God. But Ham and

his posterity rebelled against the religion of Noah and Shem, and the other patriarchs, under the rule of the terrible *Nimrod*, the grandson of *Ham* and son of *Cush*—Nimrod being the black king of Babel, who was the first sovereign and tyrant of the age, as well as the abettor of idolatry. On this account, it is not likely that the descendants of Ham, nor Ham himself, would visit Noah, as they remembered the *curse*, and their doom to servitude to be accomplished sooner or later.

In accordance with this conjecture, founded on Jewish tradition, namely, that Nimrod headed the great rebellion of his time against Noah and Shem's religion, we relate the following: The Hottentot negroes of Africa, who, as contended by *Barrows*, page 281, are the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and who (see Cook's Voyages, page 103) refuse to worship the greatest of the gods, whom they call *Goun-ya Taquoa*, or the God of gods, because, as they allege, he *cursed* their parents for a certain very great sin. In this reason of theirs, for not worshiping that great God, is there not a direct and plain traditionary allusion to the curse of Noah, and in that curse the decree of God against Ham and the negro race, which took place in the affair of Ham's seeing his father in his repose. That the Hottentots are descended from the negroes of Egypt and Canaan, is evident from their great veneration of a certain *fly*, or *bug*, which is of a bright gold color, and which they worship in ecstasies as a god. *Baalzabub*, or a certain *fly*, of old Canaan, was worshiped by the Canaanites, and is the same so often alluded to in the Bible.

Peculiar traits of religion, like the one just noticed are strong evidences of the lineage of a people, as religious impressions and usages are the last to be obliterated of any other human impressions. Thus it is evident, that, from the days of Nimrod, the great rebel against God and his religion, down to the Hottentots, as well as among all the negro tribes of Africa, there has been a marked opposition to the virtuous religion of Noah, *more* than has marked the opposition of all the other nations of the earth put together. And, as a further proof that *Nimrod alone*, with his house, family, and tribes, were the projectors and builders of Babel, we notice that Moses says, Gen. x, 10, that *Babel*, with other cities, was the beginning of *his kingdom*. If, then, *Babel* was the beginning of *Nimrod's* kingdom, then, of necessity, it was not the possession nor the dwelling of either the other sons of Noah, but that of Nimrod alone, as the text reads. According to the reading of a part of the eleventh chapter of Genesis, it would seem that all the people of the house of Noah were engaged in the project and building of Babel. But this was not so, as the scheme was for the advancement of *idolatry*, a scheme in which Noah and Shem could have had no hand. The confusion of the language, therefore, was confined to the people who were engaged on the tower, and to none else; the house of Noah, Shem, and Japheth, remaining, as to this matter, as they were; and even the negroes may have easily, after their dispersion, have recovered their mother tongue, as the confusion was *miraculous*, and meant only to affect their speech for the time *being*, not forming

thereby any *new* languages; which is evident from the fact that Abraham, the Hebrew, some hundreds of years after this occurrence, had no difficulty in conversing with the *Egyptians*, one branch of the house of Ham, at the time he and his wife went to Egypt, on account of the famine in the land of Canaan, of which we have before spoken.

This people, therefore, in the time of Nimrod, did not visit Noah, as by this means they would have been better instructed; it was, therefore, the policy of Nimrod and his coadjutors, to draw a line of separation between his people and those who adhered to the religion of Noah. The tomb of Noah is, no doubt, at the identical spot where that *first altar* was erected, and where his wife was also buried, not far from the foot of Mount Ararat. Nimrod, as is stated in the book of Genesis, was a leading hunter, and above all men was the most powerful, fearing no wild beast that roamed the forest. On this account, no doubt, it was that he derived his great popularity among the people of his race; as in every age, especially among semi-barbarians and savages, the gigantic and fierce have become the objects of veneration, and of deification after death. In this way, Nimrod became the first *Hercules*, always represented as being clothed in the shaggy skin of some monster he had slain, as well as bearing in his hand an enormous club, with which he slew all animals that came in his way—[*See plate*].

The reader may desire to know why we assume that *Shem* was the Melchisedek of the Scriptures, and the man who blessed Abraham as he came vic-

torious from the battle with the kings who had reconquered the Sodomites. We assume it, *first*, because the Jewish Rabbi say that he was Shem, the son of Noah, and certainly they had the means of knowing. And, *second*, because no other man had a right to the priesthood of Noah's house but Shem, as it was his by birthright, or by the gift of God, as he was the ancestor of Jesus Christ, according to the flesh.

During the five hundred years of Shem's life, after the flood, he, no doubt, visited all the settlements which were made by his own sons, the sons of Ham, as well as those of Japheth, giving them instruction in religion, the arts, agriculture, astronomy, geometry, letters, and arithmetic; as all these were known, understood, and practiced, before the flood; and Shem was born more than a hundred years before that event. He had time to visit *Mezarim* in Egypt, *Cush* in Ethiopia and Asia, *Phut* in Lybia, and *Canaan* in old Phœnicia, or the Holy Land. He had also time to visit the *earlier* settlements of Japheth, who had wandered westward in Europe, as well as far north of Ararat, and to communicate to the white tribes of his brother the same great things he had to all the others.

With this view of the character of Melchisedek, or Shem, the son of Noah, it is no wonder that St. Paul, a man of immense literary acquirements, should say as he did, Hebrews vii, 4: "Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoil;" calling him *better* than Abraham, in point of eminence; placing him above all other men on the earth, on account of his

wisdom, goodness and great age—for at the time he blessed Abraham, on his return from the battle with the kings of Shinar, he was five hundred and fifty-two years old, and lived after that ninety-eight years.

No doubt, therefore, but that he often visited the city Seyons, which was built by the house of Japheth immediately after the flood, and was located north of ancient Persia, near the southern end of the Caspian Sea, in the very neighborhood of Mount Ararat; and was doubtless the great mart of trade to the first settlements of the children of Japheth, along the coasts of that sea, and the rivers which run into it. JAVAN, the same whom we have mentioned in conjunction with *Madi*, ancestors of the Medes and Persians, both sons of Japheth, and the founders of the city *Seyons*, which was built two hundred and thirty-three years before the birth of Abraham, and but fifty-nine years after the flood.—*Rollin, vol.* ii, page 222.

From this fact, there can be no doubt but the race of Japheth, were the builders of many other cities, towns and villages, as well as Seyons. They were the builders of ancient *Troy*, in *Greece*, and of *Cyrene*, in African *Lybia*, all great cities, and many hundred miles asunder from each other.

Here we see, that if the children of Japheth at that early period, occupied the space between the Caspian and the Black Seas, and Greece along the Mediterranean, which is now known as Turkey in Europe, how great an empire or country they were spread over, by which we perceive the hand of Providence in their greatness, preparing them to fulfill the things

which were foretold by Noah they were to accomplish toward the races of Shem and Ham.

This *Seyons*, founded by *Javan*, one of the sons of Japheth, was, therefore, the first and eldest city of mankind after the flood in all probability, as it stood much nearer to Ararat, the place of Noah's dwelling and the Ark, than did the cities of Ham, further down the Euphrates, in the country of Shinar, Babel and Babylon. It appears that white men, the descendants of Japheth, actually, in the very first ages, found their way into the heart of Africa, as a colony, and built the city of Cyrene, the capital of negro Lybia.— *Watson's Historical Dictionary, p.* 584. This was a Grecian colony. If, then, the Lybian negroes were indebted to white men for the origin of their capital city in those early times, how much may not the ancient Egyptians have been also indebted from the same source?

Thus we are prepared to notice the first instance, on the page of history, of the beginning of the accomplishment of the prophecy of Noah, respecting the rule and predominance of *Japheth* over the races of Shem and Ham. This began to take place, as noticed on the page of history, on a great scale, not till about twelve hundred years after the curse of Noah, and about the same length of time B. C. This we derive from Herodotus, chapter ii, p. 254, who says that the Greeks in the time of Troy, full twelve hundred years before the time of Christ, had black slaves. Then after this, it is seen that they were greatly enslaved by the Greeks, in the times of Philip, of Macedon and his son, *Alexander the Great.*

The countries Alexander subjected to his arms, was the old Assyrian empire, who were of the race of *Shem*, settled along on the Euphrates, sometimes called Chaldea. He went quite to Jerusalem, south, and even to Egypt. He also made war upon, and reduced to personal slavery, in the literal sense of the word, such of the Canaanites, as had, after the times of David and Solomon, taken root again in old Palestine or the Holy Land. In this country he destroyed the city of Tyre, one of the eldest cities of ancient Phœnicia, in the country of Canaan, which neither David nor Solomon molested, on account of *Hiram*, its king, and sold the people, both high and low for slaves.

At that time, the Jews bought thousands of the negroes of Tyre, and sold them again to the *Sabeans*, a people of Arabia, as was foretold should take place by the prophet Joel. This people, the old Canaanites or citizens of Tyre, and its country, after being thus entirely broken up and sold as slaves, multiplied greatly in the Grecian countries, as they do always in all countries in a state of servitude, but were everywhere held as slaves by the white men of those times, being bought and sold the same as they are now in the southern States.

But this was not all; for the *Romans*, who were also the descendants of Japheth, as well as all the Grecian tribes and nations, bought and sold negroes, even down to the time of the apostles, and for many ages after, by thousands and millions. And when the Romans were swallowed up by the northern nations, the same as the Romans had done to the Greeks

and other countries, those same northern hordes, who were the descendants of Japheth, continued the practice of enslaving black men, all these revolutions of countries, states, empires and kingdoms, making no difference in *this* particular, with the doomed race. Such as the Greeks did not conquer and enslave, the Romans did; for it was *they*, in the victories of *Scipio*, who destroyed the vast empire of butchering Carthage in Africa, a colony at first, from the land of negro Canaan, who, under Dido, a female, about the time of Ahab, some seven hundred years B. C., pitched their tents on the African side of the Mediterranean.

Of the millions of this confused empire, hundreds of thousands were sold, the descendants of whom were held in perpetual bondage, as personal slaves, during the existence of the Roman government. And after that event, the fall of the Roman empire by the sword of the northern nations, who were also the descendants of *Japheth*, except the *Huns*, the negroes of Carthage, as well as all the race, who had been enslaved by Greek or Roman, still, in their posterity, remained slaves among the mingled tribes, revolutions, convulsions and the overturn of empires, making no difference with their fate.

After this the *Turks*, who are the descendants of *Japheth*, conquered all the regions of the east, included in Asia Minor, as Judea, and the rest of old Canaan, Persia, Syria, Armenia, &c.; so that the negro race, who yet remained in their ancient country, were still further reduced to personal slavery till none were left free.—*Newton on the Prophecies, page* 18. But

the subject of the fulfillment of Noah's prophecy, or the decree of God, respecting the slavery of the race of Ham by Japheth, or the white race, stops not here; for all the nations of Europe and Asia Minor, from the days of Alexander the Great, more or less, have sought after the negro for a slave, even in their native haunts, in Africa and the islands.

America, too, has done this in both hemispheres, ever since its discovery by Columbus, so that the race of Japheth, though dwelling on the utmost bounds of the earth, and divided by seas and oceans, have, under the direction of the providence of the God who decreed the negroes' enslavement by the whites of Japheth's race, fulfilled that decree. Thus we see that no decree of God falls to the ground, and never will, as we have said at the beginning of the section, though God had reserved the *latter ages* of the earth to carry it into effect. That this is so, let no man glory or rejoice, lest he be found glorying in the *judgments* of the Creator, which, as saith the Scripture, are his *strange* work, and thus seem to take upon himself the awful responsibilities of awarding to nations and *individuals* judgments which are above us.

Let him, therefore, who shall enslave any of the negro race, do it with reverence, as it was God who has made the white man to differ from the black, and appointed the destinies, as well as the bounds of our habitations, and permitted, in the latter ages of the earth, the children of Japheth to enslave the people of Ham, as well as he did the descendants of Shem in the *first* ages, both cases being necessary to

the veracity of the Scriptures on that identical subject. What society of men, or combination of individuals, therefore, can turn aside or abolish the steady and determined course of God's *will?* for we have every where held in this work, that the subjugation of the race to servitude was *judicial*, and not fortuitous, but was secured in the very formation of their *bodies*, *brains*, *mental* powers, moral character of their passions and color of their skin, as well as by a written decree, and will be judged at the last day according to what they *have* received, and not according to that which they have *not* received. But notwithstanding the absolute importance that *all* the prophecies of Scripture should be fulfilled, one as much as another, yet abolitionists, in their furious zeal for the cause of the negro race, make very light of the curse of Noah, in the particular of the negro's destiny, and of that part of the law of Moses, which relates to the same thing, treating them as of very uncertain application, as well as of very little force at the present time, *merely* on account of their very great antiquity.

To prove that this is true respecting them, as we suppose them to be unanimous in their published opinions on the subject, we shall quote a few remarks from one of their news prints, entitled, "*The Friend of Man*," published at Utica, Jan. 15, 1839, under the head—"*The Facts of Slavery as they Are*," as follows: "Remember (says the writer), we are now inquiring after facts, *not* theories: the facts of our *own* age and nation, not those of a *dim antiquity*, or of a distant region. We bring into the court (men-

ing before the public) the facts belonging to this trial, not the facts of a cause that was tried, and *decided* and *awarded*, two or three thousand years ago." From the above quotation of abolitionist effusions, is it not certain that the writer of the above remarks, in order to turn aside the force of the Bible, on the subject of negro slavery therein recognized, has aimed a deadly shaft from the quiver of his reckless imagination, at the sacred and venerated institutions of Moses, by the insidious words "*two or three thousand years ago;* and another at the *decree* of God, set forth by Noah, in the phrase "*dim antiquity.*" The whole of the article, as above, was intended as a *slur* upon such as resort to the Scripture to prove that the servitude of the negro race is therein allowed and justified.

To the perception of the writer of this work, the author of the "*dim antiquity*" idea might as well have written, that "although Noah did pronounce the will and *decree* of God, in placing the race of his son *Ham* under the ban of servitude to the races of both his other sons, Shem and Japheth, that it is *now*, in these enlightened times, entirely antiquated; as that was but a transaction of '*dim antiquity.*'" Suppose we were to apply this mode of comment to some other subjects of Scripture—say, for instance, to the promise of the *Messiah* made to *Eve* at the time when she had fallen from her innocence, by tampering with the devil in the disguise of a serpent, Gen. iii, 15, called, in that place, the *seed* of the woman, which is the *first* and eldest promise, as well as prophecy, relative to *that* character, which is found in the Bible,

and should say respecting it—Oh, it is too far back in time to be allowed any influence now-a-days, as it is but a saying of "*dim antiquity*," and cannot, therefore, apply to these times of *facts*, superior knowledge and light! And were we to apply *this* method of comment to the *ten* commandments of the decalogue, which are of the same date with the grant of Moses (Levit. xxv) to the Hebrews, to buy and enslave the negroes of Canaan, and should insinuate that they, *too*, are but some *words* spoken two or three thousand years ago, and on that account had lost their obligatory force, we should be ranked with those who can abuse and pervert the Scriptures to suit the times and purposes of wicked and foolish men.

Yes, so hardened, bold and impudent have many of the members of that fearful combination, the abolition society grown, that they disallow that the Holy Ghost inspired Noah at all, at the time he pronounced the doom of slavery upon the race of Ham, because they say it is preposterous to believe that God would commune with such a man as Noah, when he had but just awaked from a sleep of drunken inebriation. But the reader will remember our vindication of Noah's character on that occasion, in a former page, and should never forget, that, notwithstanding this slander of abolitionists upon that holy man, for whose righteousness the ark was commanded to be built, and mankind preserved in it, the Almighty has seen fit to fulfill and carry out, in facts, every *iota* of that decree as then announced, not only as it relates to *Ham* and his people but also to Shem and Japheth.

To discourage a belief in the minds of the people

that the Holy Scriptures justify the servitude of the negro race, writers and lecturers of the above description have sacrilegiously dared to lay violent hands on a high and venerated circumstance of the Bible, namely, that of its *antiquity;* as if a subject and doctrine, which has become aged, is, therefore, of no more influence; and in this way they endeavor to disarm those particular passages of the sacred Word, which relate to this subject, and thus open the door for infidels to laugh at Christianity and its adherents, because they refuse to receive only such portions of the precepts of that Book as suit their interested opinions, instead of the *whole.* But this kind of insinuation against those who believe the Bible justifies negro servitude, is equally against St. Paul, as well as the *prophets,* on that subject; for if we find that great judge of both *law* and *gospel,* sustaining Moses and the Jews in this thing, he, too, as well as those who were before him, who believed as he seems to have believed on this subject, must be condemned as *sinners* by abolitionists; for, be it known, that *they* would rather stamp the Bible into the mire of the earth, than to receive that opinion, so high have they set their dogmatizing feelings above all that is sacred and true.

A specimen of the recklessness of the spirit of abolitionism, is seen like tissue spinning from some opening crevice in the earth, which covers a subterranean lake of fire, in the speech of Mr. *G. Bradburn,* of Massachusetts, in the great London Abolition Convention, as follows: "But then it was said, that slavery was advocated and enforced in the Bible. Now, if it

were so, with all the veneration he had for that holy Book, if it were shown to him that it sanctioned the traffic in human flesh, he would *throw it from him*, and learn again his religion and philosophy from the flowers of the fields."—*Pennsylvania Freeman, No.* 204, *August* 6, 1840. From this it is clear, that the Bible is of no account with this society, if it happens not to coincide with the *course* of abolitionism.

But, says one, does St. Paul, in his writings of the New Testament, anywhere seem to sanction the enslaving of black men? We will hear what he has said, and then judge. See 1 Cor. xx, 21, where both the fact of negro slavery and its *legal* righteousness are as plainly, though incidentally, stated, as it is in Gen. ix, 25, Levit. xxv, 44–46, or any other doctrine of the Scriptures, elsewhere. In the above scripture, St. Paul, in making some remarks on the condition of the different classes of men, who were converted to Christianity under his as well as the preaching of the other ministers of the gospel, says, that on account of their being converted to the faith of Christ, no man was to forsake his business or *calling*, but was to remain as he was, in such a particular; showing, thereby, that Christianity did not contemplate the breaking up of the civil relations of the country, even as they were *then* in operation among the people. To make *this* point clear, he seizes upon an *extreme* case of human calling, which was that of *slavery*, and *urges* that such a one was to expect no change in his temporal affairs, on account of his faith in Christ. With a view to impress *this* very principle on the minds of *all* men in that age, he

says, in the above cited chapter of 1 Cor.: "Let every man abide in the same calling [or business] wherein he was called [or converted]. Art thou called, being a servant [or slave], care not for it; but if thou mayest be *made free* [personally], use it rather. For he that is called, being a servant [or slave], is the *Lord's* free man." That the character here referred to by St. Paul, was an absolute slave or *bondman*, is made clear by the words "*if thou mayest be made free*," as *such* language could refer to no other than to slaves, as all others were politically free.

On the above statements of St. Paul, *Adam Clarke* has written as follows, though an abolitionist of a most determined character: "Art thou converted to Christ while thou art a slave, the property of another person, and *bought* [not hired] with his money, '*care not for it*,' this will not injure thy *Christian* condition; but if thou canst obtain thy liberty, '*use it rather*'—prefer such a state for the sake of freedom, and the temporal advantage connected with it. The man who, being a slave, and is converted to the Christian faith, is the LORD'S free man—his condition as a slave does not vitiate any of the privileges to which he is entitled as a Christian. It is likely that some of the slaves at Corinth, who had been converted to Christianity, had been led to suppose that their Christian privileges absolved them from the necessity of continuing slaves, or at least brought them on a level with their Christian masters. A spirit of this kind might have led to confusion, and to insubordination, and brought a *just* scandal upon the church. It was, therefore, a very proper subject for the apostle

to interfere in, and to his *authority* the persons concerned would, doubtless, respectfully bow."

At this point, we wish to draw a certain conclusion, which is afforded in the above passages in the text of St. Paul, and this is it: If the conversion of the soul of a slave to God, through faith in Jesus Christ, did not, and could not, release him from personal slavery, in St. Paul's time, how much less, therefore, could the mere circumcision of a negro's foreskin, in the times of the Jews, which was no conversion of the soul, absolve such an one from a condition of slavery and servitude. For a *bondman* to become *circumcised*, say the defenders of abolitionism, under the laws of Moses, made him a member of the Hebrew church or nation, on which account, they contend that at the jubilees all *such* bondmen went free, the same as did all other Hebrew servants. But the above statements of St. Paul, cut off all probability of any such thing in their favor, under the Jewish law; for if the conversion of the *soul* could not assist in such a case, under the auspices of Christianity, how could a mere cut in the flesh of the foreskin of a negro Canaanite aid him in a release from slavery, and exalt him to freedom without a direct and express law on the subject? there was no such law in their favor in the Mosaic code, but there was one to the contrary.

We cannot well pass on in the subject till we have referred the reader to one or two very singular remarks of Adam Clarke, in the above comment of his, on the subject of personal slavery, seeing he was an abolitionist: "It is likely (he says) that some of the

slaves at Corinth, who had been converted to Christianity, had been led to suppose that their Christian character absolved them from slavery. A spirit of this kind (says Clarke) might have led to *confusion* and to *insubordination*, and brought a *just* scandal on the church." How different is this language of the wisest man of these later ages, from the language of the abolitionists of the present time, who, in the most dauntless braggadocia and fierce manner, condemn to the flames of an eternal hell all such men as own negro slaves—who defy all the powers of government and teach the doctrine, that, on account of any *possible* results, whether murder, insurrection, a division of the Union, insubordination, good order, civil war or loss of our country, are no reasons against nor matters of any moment, when compared with the inestimable liberty of negro men in this country! But so did not Adam Clarke believe nor teach, neither did St. Paul, as they had respect to the established order of things, and did not wish to encourage insurrection, murder and disorganization, as do abolitionists in their *ultra* doctrines.

But the above quotation, from St. Paul's writings in the New Testament, on this particular subject, is not *all* that he has said; see Ephesians vi, 5, as follows: "SERVANTS [that is slaves] be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the *flesh*, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto *Christ*." This is a most remarkable statement, as it recognizes the doctrine of negro slavery, the *master* as well as the *slave*, a state of surveillance and lowly submission to such masters, and enjoining obedience to be

paid, even to *trembling* and *fear*, with absolute sin gleness of *heart*, as unto Christ.

This language and doctrine is very different from that of the abolitionists of the present time, who say that a negro slave does right, in order to get away from his master, to steal his master's horse, his money, or any thing else, or to steal from others on the road, any thing to aid his flight for liberty. On this subject, who now is wrong, St. Paul, the Holy Ghost, Adam Clarke, or the abolitionists of America and elsewhere, who have mighty deeds yet to achieve in the line of politics, bottomed on their negro sympathies?

That the servants alluded to by St. Paul, in the verse above quoted, referred to bondmen or absolute slaves, is clear, from the eighth verse of the same, Eph. vi, 8, which reads as follows: "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be *bond* or *free*." On this verse Dr. Clarke says, that the word *bond*, therein used, means a *slave*, or one bought with money.

Again, in his letter to a Grecian convert to Christianity, whose name was Philemon, a citizen of Colosse, a white man, as the Greeks were white, he wrote respecting a slave who had run away from Philemon and had come to Rome, where *Paul* then was. This slave's name was *Onessimus*, who, for some reason or other, had run away, and, happening to hear the great orator St. Paul preach, became a convert to his principles, respecting Christianity and its author.

In that letter to the slave's master, at verses 10, 11 and 12, he says, "I *beseech* [not command] thee for my son Onessimus, whom I have begotten [in the faith] in my bonds, who, in times past, was to thee unprofitable [that is, he had been a bad slave], but now profitable to thee and to me: whom I have sent again, thou, therefore, receive him that is my own bowels."

On the words, as above used by St. Paul, "*whom I have sent again*," Dr. Clarke says, the Christian religion never cancels any civil relations: a slave on being converted and becoming a free man in Christ, has no *right* to claim, on that account, emancipation from the service of his master. JUSTICE, therefore, required St. Paul to send Onessimus back to his master. He further says on this case, "there is no reason to believe that Onessimus was of the *kindred* of Philemon, and that we must take the term *flesh*, as used in the sixteenth verse of that letter as a reference, made by Paul, to the *purchase right* Philemon had in Onessimus; he was a part of his property as a slave:" this was his condition.

Slavery is a civil regulation in this country, which abolitionists are aiming to overthrow by applying the Scripture principle of *benevolence*. But as St. Paul has not *thus* attacked slavery, who are these that take it upon them to do *this*, in the face of the Christian religion and the laws of the Union?

From the facts of the case of this slave, it is self-evident, that his being sent back to his master again, was owing to the influence of the Christian religion; as, under its sanction, neither the *convert* nor the

minister could, therefore, for a moment withhold the claims of *justice* in this particular.

Oh, but, says a wide awake abolitionist, to be sure the Christian religion allows of no injustice, and on that very account that slave should have been set free, as there is no greater injustice this side of the grave than to enslave a negro man. St. Paul, however, has seen fit to judge differently, and has given a verdict in favor of the master. Had St. Paul have viewed the case, as an abolitionist would have viewed it, he would not have sent the man again to his master, he would have told him to remain free where he was, or to go whither he would. But as a judge in the house of God, he exerted his authority in the case, and sent the slave again to his owner, on *purely moral* principles, and no other, or he would not have meddled with it at all, as indeed he had no right on *any other* ground. But some contend, and have even determined, that, because St. Paul said, at the sixteenth verse of his letter to Philemon, that when Onessimus the slave should arrive at the house of his owner, his master was not to receive him as a servant, "*but above a servant, a brother beloved*"—that he was, therefore, *manumitted*, by the authority of the apostle, and from *this*, they claim that slavery was thus abolished forever out of the Christian Church.

But such a conclusion will not answer, as it is not responded to by other passsages on the same subject—and, besides, the entire contrary appears from the same apostle's writings. The slave Onessimus, had become a Christian, and, in this particular, he

was exalted to an *equality* with his master, if that master was, in fact, a Christian at heart, as God is no respecter of the souls of men, giving grace to all alike, when he is sought unto, by black or white. This fact had elevated that slave far above his former character as a sinner, and a very bad and unprofitable slave, as Paul says he had been; yet, his *temporal* condition remained unchanged, the same as before.

On that verse, the sixteenth, in virtue of which some men claim the abolishment of slavery by the authority of Christianity, Dr. Clarke remarks, that St. Paul said as much, and no more, than to say to Philemon: "Do not receive Onessimus *merely* as a slave, nor treat him according to that condition, as before times, but as a brother, a genuine Christian, and as a person particularly dear to Paul." In all this, Adam Clarke, though an abolitionist, could see no release of this man from his temporal bondage, from anything that appears in the text.

That St. Paul sanctioned any such doctrine, as the manumitting of bond slaves, because they happened to become converted, does not appear, while the contrary is abundant, which we are able further to produce, from the text of the New Testament, and of Paul's own writings. See Timothy vi, 1—4: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God be not blasphemed. And they that have *believing* masters, let *them* not despise them, but rather do service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefits: these things teach and exhort.

If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the *words* of our Lord Jesus Christ and the doctrine, which is according to Godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strife of words."

On the subject of *this part*, St. Paul's remarks in that letter to Timothy, Adam Clarke says, that the word *servant*, in that place, signifies *slave*, and the word yoke, the state of slavery or bondage. From this, we prove the real existence of slavery in the Christian church, in the very time of its organizers and founders, and, had it been any where abolished, that critic of critics, Adam Clarke, would have found it out, and would have marked the place in the most pointed manner; but it is not to be found in the whole Bible, which we shall further show in due time.

In the above cited chapter, 6th of Timothy, at the 3d verse, there are found some very remarkable allusions to the subject of slavery, which we cannot pass over, and are as follows: "If any man (says St. Paul) teach otherwise, and consents not to wholesome words, even to the *words* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud [ignorant], knowing nothing." Now to what words of Jesus Christ does St. Paul allude, which he applies to the case of slaves? See John viii, 35, 36. "And the servant abideth not in the house forever, but the son abideth ever. If the son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." In these two verses of the Gospel by St. John, there is a manifest allusion to the *fact* and *condition* of slaves.

Of this fact, the Savior took occasion to illustrate, by way of similitude, the condition of a wicked man, who is the slave of sin, and to show that as a *son*, who was the heir in a house, could set a bond slave free, if that son was of the proper age. *So*, he, the Son of God, can set the enslaved *soul* free from sin, when he would be free indeed.

In this allusion of the Savior, we do not find the fact of slavery *reproved*, but merely alluded to, as a thing or a usage then existing, and, therefore, recognized as a practice, not in itself sinful, if practiced right and mercifully. If this sentiment is not correct, we are at a sad loss to justify the Savior's allusion to a circumstance *so* wicked, as abolitionists believe it is, without reproving it. On these very remarkable words of our Savior, and St. Paul's allusion to them, Adam Clarke has written the following: "Now the *slave* abideth not in the family, as if Jesus had said: and now that I am speaking of slaves, I will add one thing more, *viz:* a slave has no right to any part of the inheritance in the family to which he belongs, but the *son*, the *legitimate son*, has a right: he can make any servant free, though no *slave* can do this, because, we will add, one piece of property can not assist another piece of property, as they are legally powerless."

It is very likely, that, in the time of St. Paul, there was agitated the question of manumitting slaves, and that it occasioned trouble and unfriendly surmisings, as to the *designs* of the new religion—the Gospel. Paul, therefore, came out in severe terms against all such, accusing them of *doting* about

questions, and strife of words, and of being proud, or ignorant, knowing nothing. As much as if he had said, you are ignorant of the determination of God from the beginning, on this very subject, even in the times of *Noah*, *Moses* and the prophets; read, and you will learn that the race of Ham are judicially placed under the ban of servitude. On this very subject, and this passage of St. Paul, Dr. Clarke has written thus: "It appears that there were teachers of a different kind in the church at that time, a sort of religious *levelers*, who preached that the converted slave had as much right to the master's service as the master had to his. Teachers of this kind have been in vogue, long since the days of St. Paul and Timothy."

This is a true statement; for, if Adam Clarke were now alive, he would find thousands of just such levelers in America and England, who declare that the Scriptures make no difference between the interests of slaves and the interests of their masters. To prove this, we refer the reader to an abolitionist pamphlet entitled "*The Bible against Slavery*," No. 6, p. 25, 1838, where the writer labors hard to show that the Mosaic system of law made no difference between the master and the slave, in relation to their natural freedom, or optional powers, avowing that the Mosaic system was framed as much to advance the interest, and gratify the wishes of servants, as it was their masters. This statement of theirs, as above, is not true, even in relation to a *Hebrew* servant; for, whenever a Hebrew was made a slave, on account of debt or crimes, it was done by *force* of *law*, in

which neither his comfort, will, or interests, considered in a *pecuniary* light, further than that was to be treated as a hired man, till his debts were paid or the crime expiated. How much *less*, therefore, were there mitigating circumstances in the case of the negro, or Canaanite slave, who were deemed to be *lawful* subjects of oppression, except their daily food and rest on Sabbath days? Although Hebrew servants and criminal delinquents went always free, at the times of the little jubilees, as provided by the law, yet there was *one* case in which even a Hebrew servant could not avail himself of this emancipating law.

To prove this, we have only to refer to Exod. xxi, 5, 6, which reads as follows: "And if the servant [a Hebrew] shall plainly say, I love my master, my *wife* [who was born a slave], and my children, I will not go out free. Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him unto the *door*, or unto the door *post*, and his master [with his own hands] shall *bore* [or drill] his ear through with an *awl*, and he shall serve him for ever." This awful sentence of a total loss of liberty was thus passed upon a *Hebrew* servant, because he despised *his* natural privileges, for reasons of his own—choosing rather to be a slave during his natural life, than to leave the service of his master and be free! How much *less*, therefore, could the jubilees reach the case of one of the *accursed* race, who was not of the Hebrew blood, nor of the blood of Japheth! From this fact, we perceive how entirely reckless of truth abolitionists are, who set up claims in favor of the race of Ca-

naan and Ham, as servants, which the law of Moses did not accord even to servants of the *Hebrew* blood Such a position as *this*, in favor of Canaanite slaves, would have placed them in far better circumstances than were the unfortunate servants of their own race; a thing which fully contradicts the express statements of the law of Moses on that very subject; for, in that law, Hebrew servants, who were made thus by being *sold*, were to be treated as they would treat *hired* men, and not like *bondmen*.

At the very *time* when Christianity was being set forth and established in Judea and the surrounding countries, by the Savior, his disciples and the apostles, after the crucifixion, the custom of owning and dealing in slaves, greatly prevailed in all the Roman empire, and yet we do not find this practice once referred to, by way of reproof, in the New Testament. How strange, if it was looked upon by those moral benefactors of the human race, as some seem to look upon it *now!* But, as a reason for this strange omission, it is said, by abolitionists, that, although at the time Christianity was introduced into the world, slavery was every where prevalent, yet Christ, nor his heralds, did not see fit to rebuke the sin, because it would have operated against the Gospel.—*Encyclopædia, Edinburgh edition, under the head of Slavery*, their opinion is found.

Here we pause with astonishment, and inquire whether the above reason for that omission is the best they can think of? If it *is*, then it follows that God incarnate, in the economy of his church on earth, is thereby represented as succumbing to what abolition-

ists say is a *great sin*, merely because the sin was a deeply rooted and *popular* sin, and to have denounced it, would have occasioned the Gospel to have been evil spoken of, as aiming at a civil revolution. Tell it not in *Gath*, among the negroes lest they should show their ivory; nor in Christian countries, lest skeptical men might deride so puerile a captain, as the miserable idea would make the great Savior to be.

This *opinion*, found in the work above alluded to, is the most singular and monstrous that we have ever fallen in with among the written principles of men, as it represents Jesus Christ, who reigns in his own house—the church—and in the world as its creator, as being under *fear*, lest, were he to have reproved a certain great and popular sin, it would have injured the cause of religion in the world, and especially in Judea and the Roman dependencies. His business on earth was to reprove sins of every name and nature, and to introduce *principles*, which, in their effect, should establish all righteousness, without fear of opposition from the ignorance, the prejudices and cupidity of men. The prophets were not afraid to reprove sin, whether personal or national, though they lost their lives by it. How much *more*, therefore, would not the *inspirer* of the prophets reprove sin, who was in Christ, without measure? This is a hard point for abolitionism to weather; for if the *founder* of the Christian religion, in the very midst of the commission of the sin complained of, did not reprove it, who are abolitionists, that they should? Are they *more* righteous than the master? Is it not

enough, if the servant be *as* his master? Were it not far more wise to believe that God, in Christ, had respect to his own determinations on the subject of negro slavery, as signified to *Noah*, to *Moses*, and to the Hebrews, which was not to be abolished, even by the benign influences of the Gospel?

In proof that the Greeks and Romans, as above intimated, had vast numbers of slaves, we show from "*Adams's Roman Antiquities*," *page* 38. At Rome, he says, there was a market-place, which was devoted wholly to the sale and purchase of slaves. They were commonly exposed *naked*, and having around their necks a scroll, on which was written an account of their good qualities. From the sale of slaves arose the principal part of the enormous wealth of *Cræsus*. In the times of the Roman republic, the owners were allowed to put their slaves to death when they would, or to torture them by all manner of cruelties. By the Roman law-makers, slaves were esteemed the same as other property; they were not allowed as witnesses in any court, ecclesiastical or civil: it was the same, also, among the Hebrews, under the force of the Mosaic legislation, as well as among all other nations, tongues and people.

Some of the Romans, says both *Seneca* and *Pliny*, had whole legions of slaves, and others even twenty thousand. The Romans, according to *Strabo*, says Rollin, *Vol. I, page* 232, worked their gold mines in Spain by slaves. This author says, that, in his times, as many as forty thousand slaves were employed annually in the mines, who, by continued scourging, were caused to labor beyond their strength, day and

night, by which means they generally all perished under ground. But against all personal *cruelties* exercised by parents, guardians and masters, upon their children, their apprentices, hired servants, or slaves, as well as dumb animals, God's *law*, as well as his *gospel*, is *peremptory;* and although the various classes, as above mentioned, are, by the law of God, put under rule, yet does it not authorize wanton barbarity, but enjoins mercy, moderation, patience and justice, toward them.

The slaves of the Romans, in the times of Christ and the apostles, as well as of the Greeks, then mingled in the Roman empire, were of the conquered negro Carthaginians of Africa, who were reduced to vassalage, as well as to personal slavery, about one hundred years B. C.—*Rollin, Vol. I, page 237. Herodotus* says, chap. 2, page 254, that the Greeks, in the time of Troy, full twelve hundred years B. C., had *black* slaves, as before noticed. This being true, it appears at once that the race of *Japheth*, from the earliest times, had practiced enslaving the descendants of Ham, as well as the race of Shem, as God had determined from the beginning.

Thus we see, that in the times of the *apostles*, as well as in all ages before, going up to the flood, that the world was filled with negro slaves, wherever the races of Shem and Japheth were found. Now, if the practice, in *principle*, was a *sin*, and seeing it must have fallen under their notice in all places, how is it that no deunciations are found in the New Testament against it? But instead of St. Paul's reproving the practice, we find him even sending a slave back to

his master, whom he had found in Rome. Paul knew the slave, and when he was converted, and he had ascertained that he was a runaway from Colosse, and that he belonged to *Philemon*, a friend of his, and a member of the *church*, he immediately wrote a letter, gave it to the slave, and directed him to return again to his master, Philemon. Had not this slave been converted to Christianity, he never would have obeyed St. Paul in this matter, nor would he have troubled himself about it. But, as the slave was now, by his association with the members of the church, thrown under the care of the apostle, it was proper for that great minister of the faith to take the matter in hand, as *justice* demanded the return of the servant to his master and owner again; to which the slave willingly consented for righteousness's sake, as he had become obedient to the word of God. Had St. Paul had any particular objection to the *principle* of slavery, as applied to the descendants of *Ham*, now was the time for him to have stated it, and in language the most *unequivocal*, such as the scribes of abolitionism, now-a-days, would have written on the occasion, which would have been pretty strong, no doubt; but of such objections, we hear not a word from the pen of that apostle.

At *this* point of our remarks, we have a most doleful circumstance to present, which, according to the views of abolitionists, must have been a glaring breach, even of the law of Moses, as well as of the benevolent intentions of the Gospel. This circumstance, or deed of misdemeanor, is found to have been perpetrated by St. Paul himself, and related to the

case of the slave Onessimus, as above referred to. In Deut. xxiii, 15, 16, it is written: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates: thou shalt not oppress him;" and yet St. Paul was the man who sent the runaway servant to his master again. Oh, what a sinner was he, according to abolitionism! From this fact, or transaction of St. Paul, we learn two things: *one* of which is, that he did not do wrong in that case; and the other is, that the slave was a negro, or descendant of Ham. We prove that the slave was not a Hebrew, or of the blood of *Shem*, from the very fact of Paul's sending him back to his master; as he knew that the law of Moses forbade the sending of runaway *Hebrew* servants again to their masters, as above shown by the law itself. Had the servant been a *Hebrew*, it would have been unlawful for Philemon to have had Onessimus *at all* as a slave; for the law of Moses did not give delinquent Hebrews, or any of the blood of Shem, to the Greeks or white men, for slaves, as it *did* the negro race; and for this very reason, the slave Onessimus must have been a Canaanite, or one of the race of Ham.

From the very passage above quoted, Deut. xxiii, 15, 16, abolitionists claim that it is wrong to send a runaway slave again to his master, in *this* country; but the apostle acted otherwise, which he could not have done had the slave been either a *red* or a *white* man—as the enslaving of *those* races have not the

Divine sanction, nor were they ever accursed in the sense the race of Ham was.

The intention of that law, as understood by the Hebrews of Moses's time, as well as in all succeeding ages, was, that it was but a mere direction *how* they were to treat the case of runaway servants from the neighboring nations, who, in flying from their masters, whether Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, Arabs, or from any of the nations of the Abrahamic or Shemite blood, to the *Hebrews*, were to be protected, and not sent again to their masters.

As a reason for this, it should be recollected that all those nations were of the Shemite or Abrahamic blood, and could not be permanently enslaved by any Jew; and if any servant of this description of blood saw fit to leave their country and master and fly to the Hebrews, and take sanctuary under the banner of *their God*, they were not to be molested and sent again to their masters, to whom, no doubt, they had been slaves. They were to dwell wherever they might choose, entering into any business in their power, within the range of the twelve tribes. Such runaway servants were not to be *oppressed*. By this very clause of the text, "*thou shalt not oppress him*," it is distinctly shown, that this *kind* of servants, *thus* favored, were no Canaanites, or any of that race, as the law of Moses did allow of the oppression of that class of men in the matter of absolute slavery. And further, it is shown, that the kind of servants alluded to in that trait of the law, were not of the Hamite race, by the supposed circumstance of their running away from their masters to the *Hebrews*—the last

country on the earth to which a negro would run, as among that people they could expect nothing but oppression, as it was one of the very laws of the Hebrews, to enslave all the people of that character, wherever they could find them.

Neither can it be supposed that the trait in question alluded to Canaanite, or black bondmen, who might run away from one Hebrew master to another Hebrew, as, in *that* way, if they were not to be returned nor molested, the slaves of the whole twelve tribes, in a trice, at any time, could have freed themselves. For if a slave of the negro character saw fit to run away from his Hebrew master, to another of the same description, at once he was free; for the law forbade any one molesting a runaway servant. On this very account, the reader can but see, that no *such servant* as a Canaanite, could be alluded to by that trait of the law of Moses which forbade the returning of a runaway servant.

Again, if we say that *this* trait of the law related to *Hebrew* servants, who had become thus on account of poverty, or any other lawful cause, and had been brought under the provision of the law, in such cases made and provided; if we say that these were the kind of servants who were not to be returned, if any such ran away from the Hebrew masters, *then* it is not hard to see how wide a door for the commission of frauds would, by the very law itself, have been opened against the secular business and interests of the whole twelve tribes.

But *how*? says the reader. As follows, is our answer. Suppose yourself a Hebrew, and living now

in old Canaan, and that, *to-day*, you have bought a man of your tribe, who had been offered for sale, on account of debts or crimes, and paid, perhaps, five hundred shekels of silver for him, and to-morrow he runs away, going no further than to the next neighbor's, where, according to the law, your servant is not to be molested or returned—what do you lose? Why, you lose your five hundred shekels of silver, and the man goes free, cheating both the law and the purchasers.

There is no way, therefore, to understand the application of that particular trait of the law found in Deut. xxiii, 15, 16, but to suppose the servants there alluded to, pointed out the servants of the surrounding nations, not of the Hamite race. This is evident from the very peculiar phraseology of the law itself, which addresses the whole twelve tribes as being but one person, as follows: "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto* THEE: he shall dwell with *thee*, even among *you*, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates." In this passage, it is seen that the law made but one person of the whole twelve tribes, by using the terms, *thou*, *they* and *thee*, in relation to them, and also showing that the runaway servants there alluded to, were such as should come to them from beyond the bounds of the twelve tribes.

That scripture, therefore, had no application to either a Hebrew servant, or to a bought slave of the Canaanite race, as a regulation of that sort, touching the legal interests of the owners, would have filled the whole land of Judea with confusion; as whoever

might have bought a servant according to the law, was immediately exposed, by the *same* law, to lose his money—a regulation to which no community would submit in any age.

Thus we have shown, that St. Paul understood what he did, when he sent again the slave of Philemon to his owner, from Rome, in Italy, to Colosse, a city in Asia Minor, and belonging to the Romans at that time by conquest, as did all the countries of those regions in the time of St. Paul. Had Onessimus been a white man, or an individual of the race of Abraham, St. Paul never would have arrested him as a slave, to return to his master, except the man was in debt to Philemon—as no other race but that of Ham, was ever judicially doomed by the Creator to absolute slavery; and this was as well known to St. Paul, as it is to all who read the Bible with a view to understand this thing.

Surely, had the apostle felt about the enslaving of Ham's race, as many seem to feel now-a-days, he would not only have told the slave to run for it, and to steal a horse, or anything else to aid his flight—as do abolitionists—but would have made the subject the occasion of a *special* treatise to the churches, as he did other matters of great importance, and would have denounced it as a horrible sin against God and human nature. Had not the notion among the converted slaves been entertained that their religion made them equal with, and as free as were their masters, it is not likely that we should ever have heard a word on the subject from the pen of St. Paul, more than from the other writers of the New Testament. But,

as he was well acquainted with the matter in the Old Testament, and as the question did arise in the churches, he found it necessary, while in pursuit of other matters, in his letters, to write on this subject also, and in a very pointed manner. Wherefore, he said to bondmen, that they should be content with their condition, careing nothing for it. See 1st Cor. vii, 21. He said, also, to their masters, that they should treat their slaves well, even forbearing to threaten them, as they were to remember that they, also, had a master in heaven. See Eph. vi, 9, and Coloss. iv, 1.

At the very time St. Paul was traveling in the various countries of the Roman empire, the condition of slaves, says Adam Clarke (see his comment on Coloss. iv, 1), "among both Greeks and Romans, was wretched in the extreme: they could appeal to no law, and could neither expect justice nor equity. The apostle, therefore, informs those proprietors of *slaves*, that they should act toward them according to justice and equity; for God, their master, required this, and would at last call them to an account for their conduct in this respect. To this we will add, that God will also call all others to an account, who *abuse* their bondmen, as well as those to whom the apostle addressed himself at that time, whether in America, Asia, or Europe, as the institution is one of the greatest responsibility, and, under the supervision of the white man, consequences and results of incalculable amount.

It does not appear that they were admonished to *manumit* slaves, but were charged only to use them

well, and to be kind to them as such. To the slaves, he said, instead of telling them to kill their masters, and to run away to some other country, and thus become free, that they should be content, and obey their masters with fear and trembling, as unto Christ.

But this is not the way abolitionists talk on that subject: their speeches are all inflammatory, calculated to rouse the mind of slaves, and every body else, to vengeance, war and murder, instead of promoting *patience*, as did St. Paul under the same circumstances.

By abolitionists, it is most vehemently contended, that the curse of Noah upon the race of Ham, was but a mere prophecy, like all the other prophecies of the Scriptures, which foretell the good or bad actions of men and nations. But, if this be the true and only way of interpreting that passage, it may then be inquired, of what use the word *cursed* is to the announcement? Could not the communication have been set forth in softer language? Was it not enough that they were to become enslaved, without adding the degrading word, *cursed?* Surely, the *misfortunes* of men or nations cannot *thus* degrade them, as it is not considered *sinful* to suffer—especially the *innocent*. On this view, it is impossible to look upon that dreadful word in any other light, than as supernumerary and injurious to the party concerned, and, besides, as also *false;* for it cannot be shown that *misfortunes* render any class of sufferers *cursed*.

But the word of God, as in *this* and all other parts of the Scriptures, do not convey false ideas, but *true* and immutable ones. It follows, therefore, that the

word *cursed*, as used in relation to the destinies of the negro race, were used in the *imperative* and *judicial* sense—not prophetically. In these passages, Gen., ix, 25, 26, 27, the person who violated the privacy of Noah in his repose, is alluded to as being *then*, at the very *time* the deed was done, a *cursed* character, and, *in* him, all his race. In the text, as it is *translated*, the words, cursed *be* Ham, is an *imprecation* on the head of Ham and his progeny, all identified, then and there, in his person. But, as it reads in the original, *cursed Ham*, without the *be*—which is a *supplied* word—it makes Ham to have been then, at that very time, a cursed man, and in him, all his race, in relation to slavery, excluding altogether any such notion as the passages being a mere prophesy.

But, says an objector, was it not prophesied that Jesus Christ was to come into the world, and that he should be put to death by *wicked hands?* We answer, *yes;* and *add*, *moreover*, that it was not only prophesied of, but was *judicially determined*, that he *should* come into the world to die for sinners; and had there never been any wicked hands to put him to death, yet must he have died in some *other* way, or there could have been no *atonement*. It was a *decree* of God, an irretrievable *judicial* act, that Christ should die, because he became the surety of those who were condemned to death and damnation; it did not depend, therefore, on contingencies *primarily*, but *secondarily* only. Respecting the curse, or judicial act of God, against the race of Ham, we apprehend that it is to be viewed in the same light as to its fulfillment,

whether there should be found on the earth so much as one wicked man or not, from the days of Noah to the end of the world; yet the race of Ham were to be servants and slaves, or the *decree* would have failed of its accomplishment, as God saw fit to determine concerning them.

Having now finished our inquiry, respecting the fulfillment of Noah's prophecy, in the enslavement of the descendants of Ham by the race of Japheth, and of his dwelling in the *tents* or countries of Shem, as the Turks, who are of the race of Japheth, are now doing, and of his supplanting the American Indians; we pass to an examination of certain passages of the Scriptures, where abolitionists seem to think they have found out that negro slavery was abolished as far back in time as the days of *Isaiah*, the prophet, some seven hundred years before Christ.

Whatever God has said, and in his Word decreed,
The same shall come to pass in very deed:
As thus 'tis seen, though many men will rave,
Ham, to the race of Japheth, *is* a slave.
So, in the tents of *Shem*, the white man reigns
O'er all Judea's hills and Persia's plains.
To *him* (the *Gentile* race), of God, was given
The *Gospel*—the last great gift of Heaven.
When *Paul*, at *Rome*, turned from the *Jewish* strife,
And gave to *Gentiles there* the word of life:
Take the mighty boon, and rise to high estate,
Thou white man, o'er the earth and Hell's dark gate;
Supplant the black and red man, bear the sway,
And reign till time shall bring the judgment day.

TWELFTH SECTION.

Inquiries whether the Scriptures have, either in the Old or New Testaments, abolished slavery, as abolitionists assert that they have—Query, if they never sanctioned it, how could they abolish it?—The famous passage of *Isaiah*, chap. lviii, on which abolitionists found their argument in favor of the scriptural abolishment of slavery, examined, and found to have no allusion to the subject—All the Jews, their elders, nobles and kings, enslaved the race unreproved—Reproofs of the prophets, for the Jews enslaving their *own* people beyond the jubilees, but not the negroes—The famous passage of Exod. xxi, 16, which respects the *stealing* of a man to enslave, or to sell him, examined, and found to have no allusion to negroes, while abolitionists assert that it does—Isaiah's opinion respecting the Jews enslaving their enemies, chap. xiv. 2—Abolition argument against slavery, founded on the law of *love* toward our neighbor, replied to—Abolition argument, charging the institution of negro slavery with an attempt to usurp the *sovereignty* of God over the *souls* of slaves, replied to

THAT the Scriptures have abolished negro slavery and disallowed of the *principle* itself, is contended by abolitionists, who boldly aver that they do not, in any case or instance, justify it, but every where condemn and reprobate the practice, as well as the principle. But whether this is true, the reader has already seen, if he has read the preceding pages with but common attention.

But, as to the Scriptures having abolished negro slavery, we inquire *where* the passage or portions of that book can be found, which have done this; and which of the prophets, kings, patriarchs, judges, or

apostles, have thus determined this matter? As to information of *this* description, says an abolitionist, *we are able* at once to gratify the inquirer, showing the place, chapter and verses, and press them upon the reader's consideration, as they are extremely expressive and explicit, flowing from the pen of inspiration in tones of thunder, condemning the awful sin of negro slavery. See Isaiah lviii, 6 and 7, as follows: "Is not *this* the fast that I have chosen (namely), to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that they break *every* yoke. Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out, to thy house: when thou seest the naked, cover him: and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?" These passages of Holy Writ are, indeed, very plain, and, to the careless reader, seem to make an end of the matter, inasmuch as they require that every *yoke* should be broken, the heavy BURDENS taken off, and the oppressed set *free*.

But, dear reader, do not become vexed when we *affirm*, that although the passages above cited are very plain in their mode of expression, yet they do not, in any sense of the word, apply to the case in hand, or to the subject of negro slavery, as practiced in the time of Isaiah, or any other age. We affirm this, on account of *three* good and *sufficient* reasons, as follows:

1st. CONSISTENCY among the writers of the Holy Scriptures, who were inspired by the immutable God on the *same* subjects, forbids the belief that they should clash. If Moses, by so many direct statements as

are found in Levit. xxv, 44—46, allowed the Hebrews to enslave the Canaanites and other negro tribes, are we to suppose that Isaiah, under the same inspiration and law that Moses was, would contradict this? This trait of Hebrew national custom, namely, that of enslaving the blacks, had obtained from the days of Moses till the time of Isaiah, a lapse of full nine hundred years, and by the authority of the law, without reproof or restraint, as we have shown. Is it to be supposed that Isaiah would disregard all this, and deliberately write a *new* code on this subject, in exact competition with the very *law* to which he himself subscribed, and by which *he*, as well as every other Hebrew, was then governed? Had not Isaiah read, a thousand times, what Moses had said in Exod. xxiii, 32, respecting the Canaanites, namely, that the Hebrews, when they should come to possess the country of Canaan, were to make no covenants of amity or peace with the inhabitants, but were utterly to *despise*, ruin and destroy them? Had he not read the same thing in Deut. vii, 2, which directed the twelve tribes to smite and utterly destroy those nations, making no compacts with them at all? The passage in Deut. vii, 2, reads as follows: "And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them [the Canaanites] before thee, thou shalt *smite* them and *utterly* destroy them: thou shalt make *no* covenant with them, nor show *mercy* unto them." Is it likely, therefore, that the Holy Ghost would contradict, by the pen of Isaiah, that which he had directed to be written in the law of Moses, and at a time, too, when that law was the *ultimo* of legislation to all the

tribes of the Jews, and governed the prophets, as well as the people? Is it likely, under circumstances of this description, that Isaiah would say to the subjects of his charge, let the *Canaanite* slaves go *free;* take every burden from *their* backs, and break every yoke from *their* necks, and that will be the fast which will please the Lord? Can the reader fail to feel the force of this first reason?

2d. The absolute silence of the New Testament, in not condemning the practice of enslaving the negro race; and, further, its absolute recognition of the practice, and that favorably agreeing both with the curse of Noah and the law of Moses on this subject. The favorable recognitions of the New Testament on this matter, are found in the writings of St. Paul, who understood the whole subject as well as any other writer of the Scriptures, and, doubtless, much better. The places in St. Paul's writings, which recognize negro slavery, are, *Titus* ii, 9; *Ephesians* vi, 6, 8; *Colossians* iv, 1, and iii, 22; also *Philemon*, as well as other passages of the New Testament, all of which, says Dr. Clarke, refer to absolute slaves, in the *property* sense of the word.

That the *slaves* of Rome were Africans, is proved from the fact, that when prisoners were brought from Africa, they were always sold for slaves. At *one* time only, by one of their generals, namely, *Regulus*, there were brought to Rome twenty thousand African negroes, who were all sold into the bondage of slavery.—*Rollin, Vol.* I, *p.* 283. If so many were captured at one time, by but one man, how many may we not suppose were thus taken and sold during all

the wars of both Greece and Rome against Africa, during several ages? *Myriads*, no doubt; and all this known as well to St. Paul, and all the New Testament writers, as to the whole world of Asia, in those ages.

If it were true, as abolitionists imagine it is, that the Holy Ghost inspired Isaiah to write against negro slavery, as then practiced in his time upon the Canaanites, the Philistines, the Lybians, the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, and any of the Hamite race; how is it that he did not also inspire St. Paul to write in the same way, and in words as plain as Isaiah has written, according to the perceptions of abolitionists, especially when the apostle was engaged in writing on the very subject of negro slavery, practiced by members of the Christian churches, in the various countries of the Roman empire, and which churches he had planted by his own ministry? had the Holy Ghost become less liberal toward the negro race in St. Paul's time, than in the time of Isaiah?

Nay, nay; St. Paul, Isaiah, Moses, Noah, Abraham, Lot, the patriarchs, prophets, judges, elders, kings, rulers and people of the Jews, according to the whole *tenor* of the Bible, as well as *express* statements and admissions, whenever they touch on that subject, namely, the subject of negro servitude, allowed this practice without rebuke, as to the *principle*, admonishing, however, owners only, in matters of treating them well and in a merciful manner. Can the reader fail to feel the force of this *second* reason?

3d. Isaiah's real meaning, as conveyed in the passages to which we are arguing, is our third reason

for disallowing that he referred to the negro race at all, and shall contend that his remarks and reproofs, referred to such *Hebrews* as held their own *brethren* in slavery, beyond the stipulations of the law of Moses, and to such only. The law of Moses allowed of the *sale* of Hebrew debtors, to pay their debts, as well as of children, owned by poor Hebrew parents, and also of criminals, as thieves, &c. See Lev. xxv, 39, 47, 48, 50, and Exo. xxi, 7, 2, and xxii, 3, where all these cases are set down.

But the wicked Jews, in the time of Isaiah, as well as at many other times, broke over the boundaries of that law, by keeping their own *brethren*, thus sold and bought beyond the years of release, and the *Jubilees* making of them perpetual slaves, both parents and their children, as they did the Canaanites. In case a *Hebrew* was sold to a Hebrew, the law of Moses strictly forbade their being oppressed, *as* bondmen were, enjoining it upon those who bought them, to treat them as they would a hired man. See Levit. xxv, 39, 40, and many other passages to the *same* effect. And besides this, they were commanded to furnish them liberally out of the threshing floor and the wine press, and their flocks, at the times of their release, or at the Jubilees, so as to enable them to begin the world anew. See Deut. xv, 14, which immunities were never extended to a Canaanite slave.

But all this in the time of Isaiah, was deeply and horribly infringed upon, wherefore, Isaiah told them, the Jews, that their fasts and other acts of worship, could not be accepted of God, while injustice to their

own blood and brethren was at all prevalent among them, in holding the poor Hebrews in perpetual bondage, contrary to the law on that very subject made and provided. To make it clear that the reproof of Isaiah on that occasion, and in those passages, related wholly, solely and exclusively, to abused and enslaved Hebrews and their masters, we have only to observe, that the *last* clause of the seventh verse of the reproof, is confined to Hebrews, in the use of the terms, "*thine own flesh.*" The whole passage reads as follows—see Isaiah lviii, 7: "Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house; when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine *own flesh.*"

Surely, the negroes of Canaan, or of any other country, were not considered by Isaiah, to be of the same flesh with that of the Jews, as they are never called in the Scriptures, the brethren of the Hebrews, their kindred, their own flesh, &c., but always heathen. Respecting the *flesh* of the negro race, Ezekiel xxiii, 20, says that it was like the flesh of Asses, and yet abolitionists say that negro flesh is as good as their flesh is, and every way equal; we wish them much joy of their relations.

The Canaanites, therefore, who were among the Jews as perpetual bondmen, were not the persons alluded to in that reproof of Isaiah, and those who ought to have been set free by their Hebrew masters.

But, if the reader is not yet satisfied that we are right in the above construction and application in

those passages in Isaiah, we will bring a parallel case out of the Scriptures, by which the position is further supported if need be. This parallel case took place long after Isaiah's time, in the era of Nehemiah and his associates, when they were rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, which had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, about seventy years before, when the Jews were carried away into captivity the *first* time. At that time it appears that many of the people of the Jews had sold their children, to their more wealthy brethren, for money to pay the taxes while in captivity, and for bread and victuals for their families, which occasioned great trouble and complaints among the people on their return to Judea.

We will give the account as it stands in the book of Nehemiah, chapter v, 1—5, as follows: "And there was a great cry of the people, and of their wives against their *brethren*, the Jews. For there were (some) that said: we, our sons and our daughters are many; therefore, we take up corn for them, that we may eat and live. Some, also, there were, that said: we have mortgaged our lands, vineyards and houses, that we might buy [not hire] corn, because of the dearth. There were, also, that said: we have borrowed money for the king's tribute, and that upon our lands and vineyards: yet, now *our flesh* is as the *flesh* of our *brethren*, *our* children as *their* children: and, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants [or slaves], and some of our daughters are *bought* into bondage already; neither is it in our power to redeem them, for other men have our lands and our vineyards."

When Nehemiah had ascertained that this dreadful charge was true, it is said, in verses 6 and 7 of the above chapter, that he was *very angry*, and that he set a great company against those who had been guilty of this thing, and caused the offenders against the law of Moses. in that particular, to release, not only the children they had bought, but the lands, also, according to the law of the greater Jubilee, which they had kept, through avarice, beyond the prescribed limits, committing robbery in relation to the lands, as well as making *bondmen* of their brother's children, their *own* flesh and blood.

This was a case which was exactly pafallel to that which was reproved by Isaiah, applying in *this*, as in *that*, entirely to the blood of the Jewish tribes, who are in Nehemiah, as in Isaiah, called *brethren*, and the same *flesh*, one with another, as a people.

In pursuit of the *same* point, namely, to maintain that Isaiah, in the famous fifty-eighth chapter of that prophet, did not abrogate negro or Canaanite slavery, but *Hebrew* slavery only, we refer the reader to another parallel case, found in the book of *Jeremiah*, chapter xxxiv, from the eighth to the seventeenth verse inclusive, which took place between the time of Isaiah and Nehemiah.

This prophet, namely, Jeremiah, foretold to the Jews, that Nebuchadnezzar should come and fight against Jerusalem, and the whole country, burn the *temple*, and carry away the people to old Chaldea, prisoners of war, and thus ruin their nation—and *this* should be done on account of *one* particular sin, which, it appears, was the heinous one of enslaving

their own poor brethren, a crime which was a great besetment of the rich Jews, in all ages of their history.

On hearing from the lips of Jeremiah this awful denunciation, king Zedekiah, who then reigned, immediately brought the men who had been guilty of this enormity together, and required of them, by *agreement*, that they should then release, every man his *Hebrew* servant. This was done in the hope that God would pardon the nation of this thing, and withhold the king of Babylon from coming upon them, with his mighty hosts, as Jeremiah had said he would.

The account reads as follows: "This is the word that came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, *after* that the king Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people which were at Jerusalem, to *proclaim* liberty unto them, that every man should let his *man* servant, and every man his maid, *being a Hebrew* or a *Hebrewess, go free;* that none should serve himself of them, to wit, of a *Jew*, his *brother*." Now, when the princess, and all the people which had entered into the covenant, heard that every one should let his man servant, and every one his maid servant, go free; that none should serve themselves of them [*their brethren*] any more; then they obeyed and let them go. But *afterward* they turned and caused the servants and the handmaids whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids [again]. Therefore, the word of the Lord came, saying, thus saith the Lord God of Israel: I made a covenant with your

fathers, in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, saying, at the end of *six years*, let ye go, every man his *brother*, a *Hebrew*, which hath been *sold* unto thee; and, when he hath served thee *six* years, thou shalt let him go *free* from thee: but your fathers harkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear. And ye were *now* turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty, every man to his neighbor, and ye made a covenant before me, in the house which is called by my name. But ye turned [back from this], and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his maid, whom ye had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids. Therefore, *thus* saith the Lord: ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor [being a Jew], behold; I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the *sword*, to the *pestilence* and to *famine;* and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth."

This horrid fate was to come upon them, for the sole reason, that they had, wickedly and unjustly, contrary to the law of Moses, enslaved their poor *brethren*, the *Hebrews*. In all this, there is no allusion to negro slaves of the Canaanitish character, for, in the three accounts, as given by *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Nehemiah*, there is not one allusion of the kind; all their remarks being *guardedly* confined to the sin of enslaving their own race beyond the permission of their law.

If, in this direful charge, the prophet Jeremiah did include negro slaves as a part of the sin of his people in this matter, how is it that he is so extremely particular, as over and over again, to name *Hebrew* bondmen and maids, and, not so much as *once* to mention slaves of the *other* description, who were of the heathen of that country?

It is, therefore, indubitably certain, that the prophet has avoided charging the Jews with *sin*, on account of their enslaving the Canaanites perpetually, but only for enslaving the *Hebrews* beyond the term of six years at a time. To fix this on the mind of the reader, we select the ninth verse of the thirty-fourth chapter of Jeremiah, and again present it as evidence *sufficient* of the fact, that negro slaves were not included in the immunities of Hebrew servants, with regard to their being set free at the time of the Jubilees, or any other time whatever.

The passage reads as follows: "That every man should let his man servant, and every man his maid servant, being a *Hebrew*, or a *Hebrewess*, go free; that none should serve himself of them, to wit of a *Jew*, his *brother*."

To this, agree both Isaiah and Nehemiah, using the same language in effect, every where pointing out the *Jew blood*, which was not to be enslaved, leaving the negro race under the disabilities of their doom, as found in the book of Genesis and the law.

In all these accounts, there is not a word said against the Jews enslaving their own brethren, if they did it according to the *letter* of their law,

and for proper reasons; while, in the strongest terms of reprobation, they do, as do all the Scriptures, condemn and threaten every Jew with punishment, who should dare to go *beyond* in that matter. If, then, Isaiah, nor none of the prophets have abolished even *Hebrew* slavery, as it was ordained in their law, how much *less*, therefore, have they abolished *negro* slavery, which, as well as the *other*, was according to that law, the Hebrew being bounded by six years, while the Hamite slave was a slave forever.

The uproar, therefore, which abolitionists make over this passage of Isaiah, in favor of Canaanitish or negro slaves, is but an uproar and sophistry, in which they extend the immunities of Hebrew *servants* to the condition of the negro *slave*, which is false, and they know it; or, at least, their leaders do.

As it respects the feelings and opinions of the prophet Isaiah on the subject of slavery, we have a very singular account to give in this place. From this account, it is certain that he held it to be right for the Jews to enslave *any* people who were their enemies, or who had held them in captivity, whether negro or red man. To prove this, see Isaiah xiv, 2, as follows: "And the people [the Jews] shall take them and bring them to their place [Judea], and the house of Israel shall *possess* them in the land of the Lord [Judea], for *servants* and handmaids: and they shall take them captives whose captives they were; they shall rule over their oppressors."

In this case, the people who had held captive the Jews, were the Chaldeans, who, in process of time, sooner or later, were to be ruled over and oppressed

by the Jews, even to personal slavery. We do not notice this case as having any bearing on the negro question, but merely to show, that the views of Isaiah were not so abhorrent to the slavery of men, who were not Hebrews, as some seem to believe; but shows that he acquiesced in the retributive judgments of God, even to the enslaving of the bodies of men who had oppressed the Jews, his brethren. If, then, Isaiah could thus approve of the enslaving of the red men of Babylon, how much *more* the negro race of that age, who were denounced in the curse of Noah and the law of Moses? Even the *priests* of the house of Aaron—the very ministers of the sanctuary—were allowed, by the law of God, to have slaves, bought with their money. See Levit. xxii, 11: "*But if the priest buy any soul with his money, he shall eat of it:*" that is, the slave thus bought might eat of the food of the family of the priest. From *this* scripture, it is as clear as *truth*, that the prophets, priests, elders, kings and nobles, of the twelve tribes, were allowed, by the law of God, to have property *in man*, the same as they could have property in any other thing or creature, providing they were not of the race of their brethren, the Hebrews, but of the heathen of the negro race—as we do not learn from the Divine Oracles, that any other people could be lawfully or morally enslaved, irrespective of war and other contingencies. But there is another scripture, besides the one we have just replied to, in Isaiah, upon which abolitionists claim the abolishment of negro slavery. This scripture is found in Exod. xxi, 16, and reads as follows: "*He that steals a man and*

selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."

Does not *this* passage of Holy Writ, says one, put an end to the subject? Does not abolitionism triumph here? Is not this enough to terrify any man, who regards the Bible, from stealing away the poor Africans from their homes of happiness and peace, or from purchasing such as are thus stolen from those who steal, purchase, or capture them in their own country? We answer, *no;* as we do not perceive that this remark of Moses in the law has the least possible bearing on the subject. It was not to the stealing, capturing, or enslaving of the negroes of Canaan, or any other country, that Moses referred, in that passage of prohibitory law. And, as it respects the land of Canaan and the negro nations of that country, are we to suppose that God, who was about to give the whole land to the Hebrews, with all its inhabitants, to kill and destroy, that they were to abstain from taking them by *stealth*, as well as by open attack? Should we suppose *this*, it would be the same as to suppose the issuing of an order to let the Canaanites alone, which would defeat the very object of the war—which was the entire overthrow of all those nations, seven in number, great and powerful, far beyond the forces of the Hebrews.

But, says one, if the passage had no allusion to negro stealing, to what, then, did it allude, as intended by Moses, and understood by the tribes? We answer, it was intended to prevent one *Hebrew* from stealing, capturing and selling another *Hebrew*, Israelite, or Jew, or causing any individual of *their* na-

tion to go into captivity or bondage of any kind, as did the brethren of Joseph, who stole him, and then sold him to the Ishmaelites. That the passage means *this*, and nothing else, is shown and determined by a *parallel* text in the *same* law, and on the same subject. See Deut. xxiv, 7, as follows: "If a man be found *stealing* any of his *brethren* of the children of *Israel*, and maketh merchandize of him, or selleth him, then that thief shall die, and thou shalt put evil away from among you."

Thus we see that the former passage, as explained by the latter, has nothing to do with what is called *negro stealing*, either in old Canaan, Africa, or any where else: it referred wholly, solely and primarily, to the people of the Jews, protecting themselves *from* themselves, in this particular matter; for, as strange as it may appear, the Hebrews were very much prone to the stealing of men of their own blood and race, for slaves, and to sell them to strangers. A severe law, therefore, was necessary to restrain them from the perpetration of this crime against themselves. But, if it is still insisted upon by any one, that the first quoted passage on this subject did relate to *Canaanite* men, as well as to *Hebrew* men, then such persons are compelled to believe that God both allowed of the *destruction* and the *protection* of the Canaanites at the same time—rather a crooked position for a Hebrew to understand just then, when they were on the eve of a war of extermination, as it regarded the Canaanites, commanded and directed by God himself.

Could it have been any worse for a Hebrew, at that

time, to steal, take, capture and enslave a Canaanite negro, than it was to *kill* him? To kill and exterminate them, showing them no mercy, was the direct and pointed command of God, as we have before shown, Deut. vii, 2. Under so large a license as *this*, the man is a fool who will pretend that stealing and enslaving the negro Canaanites was prohibited by those passages, as above presented; especially when the law of Moses, in Levit. xxv, 44—46, directly and pointedly allowed the Hebrews to make bondmen of that people, and to use them as slaves *forever*.

To this very law of Moses, which forbade all Hebrews stealing any individual of their own race, St. Paul alludes in 1 Timothy i, 10, where it is written, that the *law* was not made against the righteous, but against the wicked, *men stealers*, &c. Now, if we have shown, as above, that the passage in the law of Moses extended no further than to the prohibition of Hebrews stealing persons of their own blood or race, as included in the twelve tribes, we are not at liberty to suppose that St. Paul meant any thing *more*, as there was no *other* law for him to allude to, as extant, when he wrote to Timothy, and when he made the remark about man stealing.

But, says one, to enslave a negro man is against the *intent* of the law of Moses, inasmuch as St. Paul has said, Romans xiii, 8, and Gal. v, 14, that *love* to our neighbor is the *fulfilling* of the law; how, therefore, can any one *love*, in the true and holy sense of the word, who enslaves a black man. This is answered as follows: "God having *judicially* appointed that race to servitude, the law of love cannot ab-

rogate it, any more than the law of love can abrogate several other particulars of judicial appointment. Such as, it is appointed unto men that they should die; the woman was condemned to be ruled over by her husband; the earth was cursed, in relation to its fruitfulness; the wicked dead are sent to hell; the earth is doomed to be burnt up; and many more things which might be adduced as being determined judicially; all of which the *law* of *love* cannot reach nor abrogate. It is idle, therefore, to urge an argument on such ground as that; for God's determinations and decrees are not frustrated by his benevolence, else there were an end to his government. To strengthen this position, if need be, we may mention that *Abraham*, *Job*, Lot, and thousands of the holy men of old, as well as modern, had vast multitudes of black slaves. Were none of these lovers of God and their neighbors, in the true and holy sense of the word?

At the time Moses wrote the famous passage of Deut. xxiv, 7, saying to the *Hebrews*, that if any man among them was found out in having stolen any of their *brethren*, the Israelites, and of having sold them, that such a one should be put to death. What a pity it *is*, that there was not, at the time, a thoroughgoing abolitionist at the elbow of Moses, to have just popped the idea respecting the strict necessity there was, of inserting simply a word or two in favor of the *negroes*, and to read as follows: If any man be found stealing any black or negro person of the race of Ham, whom Noah cursed, from this time to the end of the world. and maketh merchandize of them,

then that thief should be put to death. Such a clause would have done the business exactly. Oh, what a pity! what a pity that abolitionism could not have had a hand in the councils of Heaven about that time, as well as when St. Paul wrote to Philemon and Timothy on the subject of negro slavery. But there is still another passage of Holy Writ to be examined, which, at first sight, seems to make pointedly against the doctrine of enslaving the blacks, and is quoted triumphantly by abolitionists, as of sufficient weight and authority to crush and abolish forever, a belief in the propriety and rectitude of compelling the servitude of the negro race, as being founded in the Scriptures.

The passage alluded to is found in Rev. xviii, 13, and accuses some combination or anti-Christian establishment, called "BABYLON THE GREAT," of dealing in *slaves* and the *souls* of men, which crime, together with others, called for the wrath of God to be poured out upon it. But it is our opinion, that this passage of Scripture has no more to do with the question of negro slavery, in the literal and personal sense of the word, than the other passages of the Bible already alluded to, unless it can be shown that some great combination of men, called "*Babylon the great*," which existed in the time of St. John, *did* actually deal in slaves, which we believe will be rather difficult to make out.

There can be no doubt but this power, which is called by St. John, "*Babylon the great*," is to be understood *spiritually*, and as characterizing, by the spirit of prophesy, some dreadful heresy or anti-

Christian combination, which was to arise in the world. This *Babylon* is many times referred to in the book of Revelation, as in chapters xiv, 8, xviii, 1, xvi, 19, and is, doubtless, the same power which is called, Rev. xi, 8, *Sodom* and *Egypt*, and Rev. xvii, 5, "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth;" and by St. Paul, 2 Thes. ii, "*That man of sin*," who should wonderfully exalt himself by lying wonders, and should sit in the *temple* of God—the church—showing himself that he is God: who this dreadful power *was*, the reader may easily conjecture.

Now, *this* is the power, therefore, who is accused of dealing in *slaves*—not literally, but spiritually—in misleading the *mind*, and, of necessity, the *body*, in matters of religious *faith*.

That scripture, therefore, no doubt, should be understood, not of slavery in the common sense of the word, but rather of its *moral*, *spiritual* and *religious* meaning, as operating on the minds of men *adherent* to this "*great Babylon*" combination, who practiced *deceit*, ecclesiastical conjurations, &c., so that the *souls* and *bodies* of men were thereby sold to the devil, in leading them from the paths of truth and righteousness, in relation to love and *obedience* to God and *his* commandments.

This is the way, as we believe, this "*great Babylon*" dealt in the bodies and souls of men. It is not uncommon for the Scriptures to speak of great offenders as having sold themselves to work wickedness, as in the case of Ahab and many others. After the same manner of reasoning. therefore, as it respects

this "*great Babylon*," who dealt in slaves and the souls of men, it is to be understood, wholly and entirely of the souls and bodies of her *membership*, who she had *bought* with her religious merchandize, as specified in that chapter, namely, the 18th of Revelation.

On *that* account, the wrath of God was to be poured out on this "*great Babylon*," namely, for enslaving the *souls*, and, of necessity, the *bodies* of men, holding them under command, to do the bidding of this "*great Babylon*," contrary to the word of God, thereby affecting the real and more valuable liberties of both soul and body, in time and eternity.

We are compelled to take this course of explaining that text of St. John, lest we should be found arraigning two writers of the New Testament against each other on the same subject, namely, of negro slavery; for St. John knew full well all that St. Paul had said on that subject.

Thus, we think, we have rescued that passage of the Revelator, as well as the text of Isaiah, out of the hands of abolitionists, who, by subverting them from their true and original meaning, endeavor to make it appear that the Scriptures have long ago abolished negro slavery, which is false, either in so many *words*, or in *spirit*.

But abolitionists advance other doctrines and opinions, besides *wresting* the Scriptures on the subject of negro servitude, which they publish to the world in their harangues, books, papers and pamphlets, calculated to mislead the minds of men on the subject at issue. They say that the *principle* of enslaving

black men, whether done in *this* or any other age, in *this* or any other country, "is a system of unlimited *spiritual* despotism, and places masters in the seat of God, or rather above God, in respect to the slaves under their control. It is (they say) contrary to the *sovereignty* of God, over each and every individual, who is held as a slave. It does not recognize the right of the slave to obey God—to follow the dictates of his own conscience—to fulfill the station of a moral being—to act as a free agent, accountable to the Judge and Father of all—to the Supreme God, who says, all souls are mine—the slave system in effect, says, *this* soul is *mine*, not *thine;* it belongs to an earthly master, and thou, its creator, hast no right to command its obedience." For all this, see "*Friend of Man*," a paper dated Jan. 15, 1839, Utica, N. Y.

On the whole face of the above charge, not only against *American* slavery, but slavery in any country or age, it is seen at a glance, that the blow falls as heavily on the institutions of Moses, the practice of the patriarchs, prophets, elders, kings and people, not only of the Jews, but the Christian church also, even in the times of the apostles, as it is intended to fall on American slavery—the *principle* being the chief thing aimed at.

For if the law of that great legislator, Moses, allowed of the enslaving of the Canaanites for *life*, and also during all their generations—which we have shown was a fact—then all the Hebrews, the patriarchs, Jews and prophets, who acted on that law, are, by abolitionists, made to have been as bad as they say American slaveholders are, placing them all in

one company, and denouncing them as a set of villains, fit only for the lowest abodes of damnation itself. For, abolitionists condemn slavery of every grade and description, to all intents and purposes, in all times, ages and nations, let it have been practiced or sanctioned by whomsoever it may have been—and this they do in the very face of God, who, through Noah, Moses, the prophets and the *law*, did not only allow of *restrictive* slavery, in relation to the Hebrews, but also of *irrestrictive* slavery, in relation to the whole race of Ham, throughout all ages, or to the end of the present constitution of the earth.

But, abolitionists, in order to get rid of the fact of Bible slavery, as recognized in the law of Moses, and applied to the negro race, have argued much, and labored hard to show that the Canaanites, who were bought by the Hebrews for *bondmen* and bondmaids, always bought them of *themselves*, and never of another, as if they were the property of somebody besides themselves, and with *this* they find no fault, being perfectly contented with the idea that a negro Canaanite, should, if he liked, *sell himself*—that was all right.

But this idea, we consider a most singular position for an abolitionist to take, as they pronounce *all* kinds of slavery and slave selling or buying most cursed, and without authority, either from God or man; and yet a man may *sell himself*, even for life. How is this? Is there no *paradox* here? If a man *sells* himself, is he not sold? Is he not as much a slave as if somebody else sold him? This position of abolitionists, which, by a strange refinement, struggles to get

rid of the plain letter of the law of Moses, about Hebrews being allowed to buy slaves of the heathen round about them, *establishes* the *very* thing they are trying to annihilate, which is negro slavery; for, if the Canaanites could, without sin, sell themselves for bondmen, then, the Canaanites sold slaves and the Hebrews bought them, the persons who did it making no difference as to the *principle* of the act; it was the thing *done*, which made out the fact, not the *modus operandi;* so that even this very curious refinement of abolitionists, on the meaning of that trait in the law of Moses, has *not* rescued the point at issue from the hand of those who believe the Bible sanctions the unqualified servitude of the negro race, but establishes it.

But this position of abolitionists is but a fiction, a mere *ruse*, which, at once, can be shown to be nothing else, by a reference to the *law itself*, on this very subject, and points out the *children*, or the infants of the Canaanites, as the objects of Hebrew slave purchasers. See Levit. xxv, 45, which reads as follows: "Moreover, of the *children* of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of *them* shall you buy [bondmen], and of *their* families that are with you, and they shall be your possession." If, then, it were the *children* the Hebrews were to buy of the Canaanites, is it to be supposed that children had either the right or the ability to sell themselves? Is it not far more reasonable to believe that the parents of such children were resorted to in such cases? As to the policy of such a regulation of Moses, relative to the purchase of slaves, it is evident at a glance

as *children* could be more easily managed, and brought up to the liking of the master than could the adults. A desire in the mind of the slave to run away would be much lessened by the process of domestication, and a natural love of those who supplied their wants.

But, says one, if the Canaanites were given to be destroyed by the Hebrews, even to entire extermination, how is it that Moses should say, in the law, any thing about buying their children for slaves, seeing they could go and take as many as they wanted by force, just when they would? We answer this, by saying that the Hebrews did not fully obey the commands of Moses on this subject as they should have done; on which account, there were, always, during the whole reign of the Jews in that country, many of the Canaanite tribes living among them, with whom the Jews were not always at war. Now, in a case like *this*, if the Hebrews wanted slaves of the perpetual bondman character, they would rather, no doubt, go and buy them of such as had them to sell in a peaceable way.

With a view to such circumstances, Moses directed them to buy the *children* of the Canaanites, as among the Hebrews there were always found parents in abundance of the negro race, who would sell their children for slaves, as readily as they do now in Africa. There can be no doubt, therefore, but the Hebrews, many of them under the sanction of that clause of the law of Moses, got their living by thus buying children, and selling them again in Judea and elsewhere; for, let it be observed, that this law is not qualified, as to its *extent*, in carrying on the

traffic. Then, again, there were, no doubt, thousands of opportunities for the Hebrews, who wanted slaves of the negro character, to buy them of Hebrews who had more than they wanted, of such as were born in their own families, of parents who had been taken prisoners in the wars of the country, between the Canaanites and Hebrews.

From these views, we see no great difficulty in the way of the Hebrews procuring as many slaves as they wanted, without raising a hostile troop, carrying ropes, and rushing upon the Canaanite families, in times of peace, to get bondmen of this description, as there was, doubtless, an abundance of them born continually, throughout all their tribes, of such as were already slaves, and had been, from the beginning of the Hebrews' conquest of the country, who had been held as perpetual bondmen in virtue of the law of Moses, which said that they should be for a *possession* for them and their children forever. But in relation to the charge of abolitionists, that *American* slavery is a system of *spiritual* despotism, it is not true, on account of the thing being impossible and contrary to the nature of the human soul, as a master can have no power over the volitions of the spirit. Power or dominion over the soul of a slave, beyond the mere commands of a master, in matters of labor, was never desired by any slaveholder, as thought, mind or spirit, cannot perform manual labor, which is all that is required of a slave, and this the body must perform, if it is performed at all. It is true, however, that the mind can be persecuted, abused, grieved and distressed, and that mind retain its free-

dom of range and action, loving, hating and believing as it *will*, after all.

The charge, therefore, that the principle of slavery, is a principle which aims at a usurpation of the rights of God over the human soul, is as false as it is monstrous and impossible. God, who created the African race, and, in their formation, both of body and mind, *appointed* them to slavery and servitude, would not have implanted in the desire of the other races who are allowed to enslave them, such an enemy to his *sovereignty*, as a desire to enslave the *soul*, and to take it out of the hands of the Creator, as abolitionists say slavery does; this, God has never done; neither was it ever desired by any man who has owned a slave; as an acquirement of *such* a description, could be of no earthly service to any one.

Was the spirit or desire which prompted Abraham, Lot, Job, Moses and Washington, with millions of other good men, in those ages as well as in America, to have slaves or bondmen, as a possession, which they bought with their money, a *spirit* which aimed at the usurpation of God's government over the *souls* of such bondmen—we are compelled to say *no*, or such a permit would never have been found in the law of Moses, nor the practice passed by without reproof in the New Testament.

There is no such law in the codes of the slave holding states, that has a word to say about the *souls*, *minds* or *spirits* of the slaves, as relates to the coersion of that free principle. The charge, therefore, as advanced by abolitionists against the slavery system, is but a flare up—a flourish extra, a mere scin-

tillation of a fiery pen, as wielded by some extraordinary spasm of eloquence. If any of the laws of the slave-holding states are so framed as to incapacitate the slaves, in relation to proper marriages, and thus prevent a state of things highly beneficial to *all* orders of society, they ought to be abolished and others enacted in their place, compelling such marriages as love or fancy among the slaves might dictate, however much their lewd propensities might contradict; surely, a course like this, were better, far, for the interests of masters, as well as slaves, than promiscuous intercourse.

If God has placed the negro race under servitude, that is of itself degrading enough, without any additional circumstances of shame; and, therefore, all slaveholders ought to practice the thing in an orderly and decent manner, exalting the slave *as* a slave, to aid him all that is needful in an honorable discharge of his duties toward masters, his family, friends, kindred and his God. Slavery, conducted thus toward the negro race, would not be sinful; because God, in his providence, has appointed the white man to be a guardian over the blacks, in the characters of masters, for their good and not their injury.

As to the charge of abolitionists, who accuse slavery of incapacitating slaves to marry among themselves, is shown not to be true, from the genius, design and chastity of the law of Moses, which abhored all whoredom and libertinism. Of necessity, therefore, slaves among the Hebrews, if they would delight in each others company, as males and females, they

must have been married, or the curse of God would have been upon the whole twelve tribes. See Deut. xxii, 20, 21, and xxiii, 17, 18, where it is seen how very severe the law was against all offenders of a lewd description among the Hebrews; and are we to suppose that they were indifferent to the conduct of their bondmen and bond maids in this particular? Consequently, marriages must have taken place as much among their slaves as among the Jews, their masters.

Thus, it is evident, notwithstanding the fine spun goods and chattel arguments of abolitionists, that a state of slavery does not *essentially* affect the marriages of slaves among themselves, as if slaves in consequence of slavery, are, in *all* respects, really and *bona fide* metamorphosed from human beings into some kind of implement, as an axe, a rake, or a wagon, which have neither passions nor souls. As to the famous passage found in the Constitution of the United States, which reads, that it was held by the powers of that Constitution, that all men are born "*free and equal*," we have not a thought that any allusion was had, by that phraseology, to negro slavery, more than to men in the moon. The whole and only allusion, was to the *titled* dignitaries and nobility of monarchical governments, which enforced upon subjects and mankind, the hateful idea of *master* and *vassal*, *lord* and *serf*, *plebeian* and *patrician*, which distinction, to the minds of the framers of the constitution, was abhorrent to all their views of political liberty. If this was not so, and that clause had the negro's case in its eye, as well as the above,

it is extremely singular, that, in the whole instrument, the race is not mentioned, nor their condition of slavery.

Having shown, in this section, that Isaiah did not abolish Canaanitish or negro slavery, and that the passage against man-stealing did not relate to any people except the Hebrews, as well as that slavery does not incapacitate slaves as to lawful marriages, with many other matters, we next proceed to an examination of various notions and opinions of abolitionists, which, as we apprehend, are miserably out of the way.

Thus, from Isaiah's pen, in word or deed,
The negroes of that time were never freed:
The curse of Noah, stood e'en then in force
As did the *law*, together with that curse.
No man had dar'd to dash the sacred page,
With change of purpose in that ancient age,
As fearless men do *now*, who wish to see
Mutation, where the truth should ever be.

THIRTEENTH SECTION.

A further exhibition of the opinions and doings of abolitionists in America—Consequences, if they carry their plans into effect—*Sympathy* is the lever by which they operate—Men should beware how they array themselves against the decrees of God—*Mysterious* providences of God toward man—Proposal to abolitionists, by the author, to assail *other* mysterious providences of God, as well as the one which respects negro servitude—Reckless opinions of abolitionists respecting the southern states—Effects of freeing the negroes in the British West India Islands—Effects, were the slaves of the southern states freed all at once—Proofs respecting the insincerity of English philanthropy toward enslaved negroes, and of their non-reliance upon the labor of freed slaves—Proofs of a suspicion that English vessels are now engaged in getting slaves from the interior of Africa, as formerly—Consequences, should the Union become divided on the slave question—Great possessions and power of the English all round America—Their designs—Intended possession of the Oregon territory—Cruelties of the English in India, where they have conquered—Coalescing of American abolitionists with the English, on the subject of American negro slavery, as shown in their speeches in London, with many other matters.

On the subject of negro slavery, abolitionists have said and done much in America, to raise a tumult among the people; and they have succeeded, by resorting, like hackneyed politicians, to all kinds of extravagant arguments, positions and stories, with the view of winning their way to *political* power in the country. When this shall be accomplished, if ever it can be, we will venture to foretell that the Union will be two distinct governments. The southern

states are determined to hold the rights granted to them in the great compact of the Constitution, with respect to negro slavery, as in this right they feel, to a man, that their happiness and security, as to wealth and its resources, depend; for it is impossible, without *this*, to cultivate the country: any and all advances, therefore, of the North, to meddle with that subject, will be repelled with anger and violence—the natural result of encroachments upon the resources of any people. If, therefore, abolitionism is persisted in, there will arise a division of the states, as sure as effect will follow its cause, with all the horrors of such an event.

The great lever by which abolitionists operate, is that of a pretended *sympathy* for the negro race, in their condition of slavery, causing the people who hear them to take for granted, as truth, *all* the horrible stories of atrocities and crimes, perpetrated by southern planters, committed on the bodies and souls of their slaves. No matter whether the revolting stories are true or false; so long as they can get them to be believed, they will answer the purpose just as well. Men should beware how they enter the list against the decrees of Heaven, on any subject, and contend about its judgments, marshaling their eloquence and intrigues in battle array against them, if such judgments or decrees happen not to suit the views of discontented and designing men, who would lead a well meaning public as they list, with no other views than the exaltation of themselves to public place and power. When this shall be accomplished, if such a thing can ever happen, the great sympa-

thetic impetus by which the machine now is moving, will cease to exist, passing away like the fogs of the night, leaving the negro race to look out for themselves as heretofore. Thus will end the mooted subject of negro excellencies; the men who now admire the race, and see in them the germs of prodigious mental powers, will not be found, as other business than the exaltation of a people, upon whom God has passed his decree of servitude and inferiority, secured in the imbecilities of their very natures.

Suppose the negroes in the southern states were all set free; would the southern and tropical countries get their plantations of corn, tobacco, cotton, indigo, oranges, rice and sugar cultivated? The whites can not labor effectually in those countries, as they can in the North, but the negro man is *created* in such a manner as to resist, or rather to agree with, the heat, fogs and dews of that atmosphere, so that he is not injuriously affected by it, as are the whites.

There is no system but that of compulsory servitude, by which this labor, on which so much depends, can be done; for if it is left to the free will or the necessities of the blacks, there could never be any certainty, as instances of freed blacks in the English West India Islands refusing to work, has often occurred, and this even among the better sort, such as were members of religious societies. If, therefore, these occurrences take place among the better sort of blacks, what may not be expected from those of a more improvident turn of mind, such as is the great mass. On the island of St. Domingo, says *Barclay* on Slavery in the West Indies, pages 8, 137, 350, 357,

once justly termed the Queen of the Antilles, cultivation has nearly ceased, the exportable commodities having dwindled down from one hundred and fifty-one thousand tons, to little more than seventeen thousand. President *Boyer*, of St. Domingo, offered to the free negroes of America, six thousand in number, to give them land in the island, if they would come and live there and work the land. But when they had seen the country, and the people of their own race, they were glad to return to America, as bad as their condition is represented to be in the United States, which they preferred to all the mighty privileges of Hayti, under a black president or king.

Barclay further states, that the case of the *Maroons* in Jamaica is no better, showing how little the possession of mere freedom betters the negro's condition. They have been free ever since the English took possession of the island. Have they, inquires Barclay, become more civilized, or more industrious? Every one knows they have not. The men continue to roam half naked in the woods, hunting and fishing, compelling their women to do the work, entirely disregarding all the conveniences of industrious life, choosing rather to be thus wretched than to labor. This is exactly the character of their brethren, the Hottentots, and the other tribes of Africa, who are so lazy and improvident, says Damberger, the traveler, Vol. I, page 57, that they will nearly starve before they will even fish or hunt, preferring to wander in the woods, living on berries and roots.

With this view, it would be national madness to emancipate the southern blacks; besides, the irrepara-

ble injury to the very negroes themselves, in casting their myriads—poor, ignorant, helpless and naked—upon imbecile resources, placing them in a condition favorable to immediate destruction. The slaves of the southern states, it is said, amount to more than three millions. Were this almost countless host set free *to-day*, who can calculate the horrible mischief and ruin that would follow, not only to the white population, but to the blacks also? On the first night of the day of their emancipation, there would be heard over the entire land, the bleat and bellowing of flocks and herds—fires would be seen in all directions, by which their cooking in the open air would be carried on. All this would be foreseen by the calculating whites, who would be prepared with guns and defensive arms, when murders and strife would rage in all directions. What next? The military would be put in requisition, when the work of death and slaughter would go on like a fire in the wilderness, over the entire southern states. The negroes would now become the objects of terror and midnight dread to houses in remote and unprotected places. Prisoners would be taken in multitudes, who would be shot down or hanged without judge or jury. In such a state of things, the negroes would take to the woods and caves of the mountains, and the morasses of the lower lands, from whence sallying forth in different portions of the country, as they should be impelled by hunger, revenge, or love of violence and robberies, perpetrating deeds of horror and crime every where. To head and lead them on, there would not be wanting base white men, who, to profit by the times, would

furnish arms and provisions, exciting the wrath of the blacks, on account of their former slavery and present trouble.

But, says one—an abolitionist—all this, as above, is but conjecture—a mere fiction—which supposes that the negroes would not be willing to labor on the southern plantations, were they emancipated. But *experience*, in all cases where the thing has been tried, proves that the conjecture is true, in a great measure, and, besides that, they manifest no such emotion as *gratitude* on such occasions. An exhibition of their feelings, when set free, is seen in the fate of the white owners on the island of St. Domingo, who, when the French National Assembly, 1791, decreed that all the negroes of that island were *free* and *equal* with the whites, they immediately butchered the whole population.—*Butler's History of the United States, Vol. III, page* 392.

This was one of the wild, deluded and mad decrees of the horrible French revolution, which had for one of its immediate effects, the total extermination of the white population of St. Domingo, in which neither age nor sex were spared from the dagger. The women were violated of all ages, and then killed, so great was the hatred and violence of the freed blacks. Were the same course pursued by the great South, in setting the slaves all free at once, there would, beyond all doubt, follow a tragedy of the same description, as there is no natural love between the races, especially when the negro is made free and equal. In this particular, the abolitionists of America, in their doctrine of an immediate and simultane-

ous emancipation of the negroes of all the southern states, are as far out of the way, as were the furious mobs of the French revolution, who could not see the difference there is between black and white. Were the three and a half million of slaves of the South set free, and were they, to a man, to manifest no hostile feelings, yet, how could they be saved from becoming paupers over the whole of those countries, seeing they have no land or means of support? Their natural improvidence of mind is well known to all; on which account they would, as to the great mass, have to be supported by the whites as legal paupers, unless they were *compelled* to labor, to prevent such a result, which compulsion would be but a renewal of slavery, were it resorted to. Perfect and unqualified liberty, extended to the slaves of the whole South, would be the certain ruin, not only to the great negro population, but of the whites also, as the required labor would not be performed; and yet the blacks would have to be supported by the whites, who would soon have nothing to do it with, as the wealth of the whole slave states depends on *agriculture alone.*

The interference of the northern states with the slave question, as to the *principle* of the thing, is a most unwarrantable violation of *state rights*, inasmuch as the slave system, as practiced in the South, is no injury to the North, but rather of immense good, as shown in the production of tropical commodities; in which fact it is clearly seen, that the interests of the two regions of the Union are blended in one. He, therefore, who favors the interruption of state rights granted in the great compact, as set forth in the Con-

stitution, is a *disorganizer*, and is blind to the interests of the great family of the Union, therein agreeing with the bitterest enemy (the English government) America has among all the nations of the earth, who are ever aiming to cripple the commerce and productions of this country, in order to favor that of their own. In agreement with this disorganizing spirit, there is, at this moment, existing a powerful combination of abolitionists, who have formed a multitude of *lines* or *routes*, by which runaway slaves are enabled to make their escape from the respective states bordering on the North. These men furnish money, horses, and all necessary aids for the escape of runaways, giving them countenance and support in their houses, until they can reach the Canadas; thus coalescing with the British in robbing the citizens of the South of their property, as recognized in the Constitution of the States.

What is to be thought of such men, who not only violate the ceded and acknowledged right of the slaveholding states, but are also united with an ancient *enemy* of the Union, in disturbing and endangering the peace and safety of the whole country?

In pursuance of this kind of violence and outrage upon the feelings and lawful interests of the public, the Massachusetts Legislature of 1843, have passed a *law*, that no difference shall be made by the agents of steam cars on the railroads of that State, between *black* and *white* passengers; in this way compelling citizens of their own state, and those of the others, as well as foreigners, to mingle and associate with

blacks, whether it is agreeable or not.—*See "Daily American Citizen," Feb.* 2, 1843.

Do the people of Massachusetts, or abolitionists in general, imagine they have a right to make laws to compel an association between two races of men, so different from each other as are negroes and white men—a difference which God himself is the author of, and was, therefore, never to be infringed? Such conduct is nothing short of *rebellion* against God, manifested in this attempt, confounding the order of creation.

Is it not far more wise to let the negro race remain as they are in the South, than to set them free, and thereby put them in a position of becoming immediately, in all the states, wherever they may choose to wander, an expense as *paupers*, and, at the same time, destroy the agricultural interests of one-half the United States, as it is *impossible* to supply the place of the slaves with white laborers, in the hot climates?

It is said by abolitionists, that on account of the slavery of the South, that the costs of carrying the *mail* in those regions, amount to more than the income, because slavery, *they* say, discourages labor; but this position of theirs must be false, as, without the negro's services, there would be no agricultural labor *at all;* in which case the costs of carrying the mail would be immensely increased, and the income depreciated in the same ratio.

There is, therefore, no way under the light and auspices of Heaven, by which the southern portions of the United States, and other tropical countries, can be inhabited by civilized men, but by that of negro

labor. And as negroes will not labor, unless compelled, there is, therefore, no way left in the Divine Providence to accomplish this, but that of their enslavement.

That the English put no dependence in the dispositions of the freed blacks to do the work of their plantations in the West India Islands, and elsewhere in their various and great possessions in different parts of the world, is shown in their new expedient of inveigling away from their homes and country, a certain class of the natives of India, called *Hill Coolies*, who they employ instead of the slaves they have freed, whose labor will cost them even less than their former slave labor. For an account of the *Hill Coolie* business, see Little's Museum of Literature, Science and Art, Vol. 34, No. 189, p. 140, year 1838.

These Hill Coolies are not negroes, but a yellow, swarthy race, of the lowest of the laboring casts in India. According to the work above quoted, it is said that there are circumstances attending the inveigling these men from their country, to traverse half the globe in quest of labor, which shows that some principle, far enough from justice or mercy, actuates the English in this business, notwithstanding their seemingly noble generosity in manumitting their slaves, which is trumpeted over the whole earth, as a deed of immense benevolence and sacrifice. The Parliament of England do not often make sacrifices in their bargains, nor relinquish their grasp of power, in any particular, *gratuitously;* if they did, they would not oppress their own subjects as they do, on which account the great mass of their people lack their

daily bread. This is well known to all the world, and is occasioned by perpetual and exhorbitant taxations, causing the people of both England and Ireland to run away to America, and other countries, to avoid being starved to death.

Even the abolitionists of America denounce the English government in the most direct and accusitory terms, in relation to insincerity, respecting their profession of philanthropy toward enslaved human beings under their control, in the conquered countries of India. The abolitionists charge the English with aiding in the emancipation of the negro race, just as much as their *political* interests invite them, and no more; this is no doubt a true charge.

To show the truth of this charge, as well as the fact of English insensibility to the negro's liberties, we see, in the N. Y. Express, June 21, 1842, that they are *now* actually in the business of getting negro's from the wilds of Africa, along the coasts of the river *Gambia*. This, however, they do not affect in the same way as heretofore, or prior to the compact of the nations on this subject, but they do it under a *form of law*, in the shape of an *indenture*, the same as taking apprentices. In affecting this, the negro is compelled to take a pen between his fingers, while the hand is guided by the grip of the master, so that the *name* of the negro is set to the seal of the instrument, who is as ignorant of the power of the article as would be a monkey, were one compelled to write

The blacks, thus apprenticed are brought from the interior by negro capturers, as formerly employed by the English. and paid for so doing. The term of

time they are thus apprenticed, is fourteen years. But when the time is up, who is there to tell them they are free? will their masters?

As late as February, 1842, a vesel of five hundred tons left the river above named, laden with five hundred such apprentices. Thus, it is seen, that the English have invented a way by which they avoid the *virtue* of the treaty of the nations, who have decreed it *piracy*, to procure slaves from Africa, and yet desire to be lauded, because of her great love for the liberties of the negro race, *especially* such as are slaves in America.

There is another view, in which this great and seemingly generous act of the English, in setting her negroes free, is to be examined; and this relates directly to the destruction of the produce of the southern states. Could England but cripple America in this particular, and lessen in any degree, or wholly destroy the production of rice, cotton, tobacco, &c., it would increase their own trade in these articles, as these very products will soon be poured forth from their possessions in *Africa*, in amount sufficient to supply all their own wants, and even to sell to American manufacturers. Now let the negroes go free in the southern states, and this great job is done.

It is evident, therefore, that true benevolence and philanthropy, had no influence on the mind of the English parliament in emancipating her slaves, but rather, in that transaction, there was designed to be sown the seeds of future profit and speculation in the *division* and *ruin* of the United States. If the negro question can but be pushed hard enough and

long enough to provoke the southern states, to separate themselves from the North, and to form a new government, then a civil war will arise in the country, when the English will fall on, as opportunity and advantage may offer. All her powers in the Canadas, the Indians of the far north-west, with the runaway negroes, the latter of whom amount, even now, in Canada, to many thousands of drilled troops, who are ready for a day or an hour to rush to the battle, as directed by their masters.

To this mighty plan of ruin, the abolitionists are blinded by the deceitful flatteries of an enemy, who invite them to England to talk about the awful sufferings of the poor slaves in the free states of America, to make speeches and to weep, while they encourage the fanatics to go on in their political adventure, of sooner or later getting an abolition president, senate and congress; then would be achieved the liberties of the negroes, an event which the English care just as much about, so far as it relates to the happiness of the race, as they do about the liberties of the kangaroos of New Holland, except as such an event would make for their *own* interests, in the ruin of this country.

The possessions of the English nearly surround the United States at this moment, commencing at the West India Islands, from thence to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Lower and Upper Canada, New Britain, reaching quite to the Rocky Mountains, and a part of the almost boundless *Oregon*, comprehending all that region of unexplored country beyond or west of the Rocky Mountains, quite to the

ocean. This vastly important country they had the impudence to claim, because, as *they* say, Captain Cook discovered the coast in one of his voyages round the world, and have actually made a settlement on an island in Queen Charlotte Sound, at the confluence of the Columbia with the Pacific. Here they have a park of artillery, consisting of a hundred large cannon, with all the other munitions of war, besides several ships of the line, always afloat in those waters. At this place they furnish their hunters with articles for the Indian trade, consisting of guns, hatchets, knives, clothing, trinkets, ammunition, &c., paying no duties to the American government for the introduction of these wares, as they ought to do. In return, they receive of the Indians and traders, the furs and peltry of that vast region, inhabited by many Indian nations. In this very region of country, there are more than eighty thousand inhabitants under British law. They have also recently taken for debt, from the government of Central America, a large tract of land, so situated as to eventually command the isthmus of Darien—that narrow strip of land which unites North and South America, a position which, ere long, will give them untold advantages, in case of the construction of a ship canal through, from the Pacific and the Atlantic oceans, instead of going round Cape Horn, as they do now.

The name of this place, at the mouth of the Columbia, is Vancouver. It is evident, that the English do, in reality, covet the control of the whole earth; for at this moment, she gives law to more than sixty

millions of the human race, in the Indies alone, and will, eventually, to all China, Hindoostan, &c., beyond the Russian possessions, and the other countries of Europe. The English parliament, at this moment, govern more than one-eighth of the human race, which consists of about eight hundred millions, one-eighth of whom are under the control of the lords of England. Is not this a power to be dreaded, and to be watched against? The possession of the Oregon region is of very great importance to the future glory and benefit of this country, as, by it, not only many new states may be added to the Union, over which the benign principles of a republican and popular government may be extended, but the trade with China, and the whole vast countries of the western ocean, along the coasts of Asia, would be secured to the cities, towns and countries yet to rise, all along the coast of the Pacific, which belongs to America.

It was in these very regions, along the coast of the Pacific, that the *first* inhabitants of America, after the flood, settled, who came from *China*, across the ocean, peopling the islands in their course. These *first* inhabitants were the authors and builders of the great cities now in ruins, found in both South and North America, the discovery of which so much astonishes mankind at present. And the reason why they had a knowledge of architecture so perfect, as is manifest by the ruins now every where being discovered in the western and southern regions, is, because they derived it from the family of *Noah*, at a time so near to the flood, that the art was not then

lost when they came to this country. The ruins, therefore, above alluded to, are *specimens*, not only of the architecture of the first age after the flood, but also of the *antediluvian* world, as it cannot be supposed that any other mode of building would have obtained so soon after that event, and when the nations were but young. Were we even to conjecture that *Shem*, the great *Melchisedek* of the Scriptures, may have visited America; we do not feel that it could be considered as a thing impossible, when it is recollected that he lived five hundred years after the flood. Long before five hundred years had passed by, the children of Noah had begun to people the shores of the eastern ocean opposite to America, as well as the islands adjacent. They had a knowledge of ship building, as shown in the construction of the *ark;* on which account mankind, and, among the rest, the Phœnician negroes, availed themselves of navigation. What, therefore, was to hinder his visiting the new settlements, not only on the islands, but those on the continent itself. Among the Mexicans there is still a tradition of the great *Manco Copac*, who once was among them, from whom they received all knowledge respecting agriculture and the arts. Were this not so, or, at least, had not the people of *Peru*, and of Mexico, have had, at the outset in this country, some extraordinary impetus of the kind, they would not, in all probability, have arrived at so great a perfection, as they did in many respects, as was seen when the Spaniards overran those countries, and as is seen in the amazing ruins now being discovered, which denote a state of architectural knowl-

edge far beyond any thing done by the native nations *since* those *first* ages. It was along that coast and the countries adjacent, that the heft of the first population existed, when the regions of America, along the shores of the *Atlantic*, were in a wild and unknown state, except where the Chinese had crossed the continent, as at Yucatan, and other places further south. Europe, at that time, was unknown, as men had not found their way so soon through the unknown wilds from the Euphrates, a distance of more than four thousand miles to the Atlantic.

This very region, the coast of the Pacific, along the whole length of the *Oregon*, which is a country of nealy seven hundred miles in length, by four hundred wide, is destined to become again as populous as at first, and that, almost immediately, when the ocean of the Pacific shall again be whitened with the sails of commerce, carried on between America, China, and the Indies. Were it not much better that the Americans should avail themselves of all this greatness, than that the English should do it? which is the plan they are in pursuit of, as well as the subjugation of all the eastern world *west* of this country.

The English, in their secret councils, had determined that the United States should be bounded on the west by the Rocky Mountains, on the north from sea to sea, by the Canadas and British America, and the south by her own and the Mexican empire: thus, the design was to hem the United States in on every side. Now, with a view to aid in the acomplishment

of all this, press the glorious negro question hard, and still harder, till the southern people shall be provoked to declare themselves independent of the North; then one grand step toward the final ruin of America will be taken, never to be recalled.

From the circumstance of the transportation of the wretched Indian men by the English to work their plantations in the hot countries, it is evidence beyond all argument to the contrary, that they do not, and dare not depend on the emancipated blacks to do this work. On this account the great argument of abolitionists, namely, that the negroes will certainly work faithfully for their former masters, out of pure gratitude for the gift of their liberty, is refuted, and should open the eyes of all honest abolitionists to a sight of the phantom the English have put them in chase of.

To exalt the negro race to an equality in Christendom, politically, with white men, will not subserve the purposes of humanity toward that race, as they are not capable of sustaining a standing on ground so high. Had not the Creator have estimated the African race as exceedingly inferior, the decree of servitude would not have been announced against them. To exalt this people, therefore, to political equality, will be to admit of a deteriorating element in the midst of superiors, which will amount to nothing more or less than a *blemish* in the heart of the institutions of the country, on account of their natural incongeniality of natures, passions, character and constitutional make.

In all the states where they are free, the negro pop-

ulation decreases in numbers with a rapid stride, on account of their natural improvidence, which occasions the premature death of their infants; the doctrine of emancipation, therefore, is but a doctrine of death to the negro, though bearing the sweet name of *liberty* written on its front.

That the great men of England, her rich mer chants, &c., are not honest in the prejudice they have occasioned in the world against America, on account of negro slavery, is seen in the remarks of Sir Robert Peel, Premier of the Empire, who accused the merchants of his country of being still deeply interested in the *slave trade*, and stated that the evidence of the fact could be produced.

As a further and still more striking evidence of their hatred of human *liberty*, we notice their late operations in India, see the following account, given by the *Rev. J. Piermont:* "The sanguinary war by which Great Britain has subjugated millions of India, and the stern despotism with which she rules and starves them, that her merchant-princes may roll in splendor and bask in voluptuousness, have a voice which the whole thickness of the globe cannot keep from our ears. A more beautiful country than that from Cuddalone to Tanjore, in Madras, cannot be imagined. The dense population and rich soil give their energies to each other, and produce a scene of surpassing loveliness. But the taxes and other causes, keep down the laborers to a state *below* that of the southern slaves. Go with me into the north-west provinces of the Bengal presidency, and I will show you the bleaching bones of five hundred thousand

human beings, who perished of hunger in the short space of a few months. The air, for miles, was poisoned with the effluvia of the dead—the river choked with floating corpses; jackalls, vultures and crocodiles, fattened upon the bodies of men, women and infants, in many cases, even before life was extinct. This occurred in British India, in the reign of VICTORIA I."

Under the administration of Lord *Clive*, a famine in the Bengal province swept off *three millions;* and, at the same time, the British speculators had their granaries *filled* to repletion with corn, which the inhabitants were too poor to buy, while the grain was exported elsewhere, and sold at a higher price than it could be sold for in that country.

This is the people and government with whom the abolitionists are now coalescing on the subject of human liberty and human rights, to the very great injury of America, and to their own expungeless shame.

That abolitionists have been, and are now, in secret and open compact with the leading characters of England, on the subject of slavery in America, is shown from the speeches made in the great meeting of the abolitionists of both countries, held recently in London.

A *Mr. Wendell Phillips*, in a set speech in that mighty convention, stated as follows: "That though the connection had been dissolved between this country (England) and America, as far as holding its own parliaments, and directing its own affairs, yet they

were in its vassalage, as far as *talents* and *genius* were concerned. The anti-slavery abolitionists had eloquent and devoted men in their cause, but the American public would not listen to them. *England*, and *England* alone, was the *fulcrum* by which American slavery was to be uprooted forever. It was not with America (to do this), for it was beyond her power."

If it is beyond the power of America, in her legislative halls, to help herself in *any* respect, whether in relation to slavery or any other matter, how is a foreign power to assist but in a way of aggression and insult, as invited by abolitionists, in their adulatory and fulsome speeches, as is seen in the above? In this speech of Mr. Phillips, it appears that he readily and eagerly gives the meed of praise, in relation to *genius* and *talent*, to America's worst enemy, the English, which is an *infinite untruth;* for, as yet, that government have not genius nor talent enough to be *just*, *liberal* and *wise*, toward her own subjects, but crushes them down in every corner of their empire, with taxations unbounded and without end.

In this speech of *Phillips*, the English are fairly invited to take a part in revolutionizing America on the subject of slavery, when he said in that oration, that "*England*, and *England* ALONE, was the *fulcrum* [or lever power] by which American slavery was to be uprooted forever."

In that meeting, a *Mr. Galusha*, an American, who thought to say something which would greatly tickle the ear of the nobility, and, withal, if possible,

to go *beyond* his brethren in extravagant remarks, said, "The only apology he could offer for his country (on the subject of slavery) was, that it was possessed by the *devil*. The delegates from America asked for the aid of the people of England, to cast this devil out." This man must be a believer in witchcraft.

In some of the West India Islands, where the slaves have been set free, it is *known* that a state of almost universal vagrancy among the negroes has taken place, who do not labor more than one day in six, and barely enough to keep soul and body together, the residue of the time being spent in thieving, drinking and debauchery, which has been the character of the race in all ages.

It is well known that the negro nations are unconquerably fond of ardent drinks, which, in a free condition, is one reason of their misery, the use of which, in a state of slavery, they cannot indulge, as their masters will not allow it. Their liberation, therefore, would only fill the entire country with straggling paupers, especially the northern states, as is seen in all the towns and cities of the free North, as very few of the blacks elevate themselves above a condition of vagrancy, when in a state of freedom. In the different states of the Union, where the negroes are free, there are found many little settlements of this people, but always in some out of the way place, from whence they sally forth by night to steal, in a small way, from the farmers of their neighborhood. But in the slave states, this they cannot do, as slaves are fed and clothed by their masters, far better than

those who are free, and are also withheld from rambling and wandering about the country If such settlements and such neighbors are desirable appendages to white communities, then set the negroes free in all the states, when the object will be abundantly realized, as a reciprocation of the immunities of white men in their social capacities, can never be extended to the blacks, however visionaries may fume and bustle to the contrary; as the very elements of the physical existences of the two races—the whites and the blacks—render such an event impossible, except by *amalgamation*, which would be the end of both races, in the production of a mulatto species, which were produced, not by the Creative hand as being original, but by a *sin* against the laws of human nature.

Were the three millions and a half of slaves in the South set free, the whole states would become infested with gangs and bandit parties, in all the wild and more unsettled regions of the country, instead of cleaving heart and soul to hard labor, as does the white man, for the sake of bettering, physically and morally, the condition of his race, and to *keep* it thus bettered.

In the New England states, where the negroes have been free these fifty years, have they in the least elevated their characters or condition as men, who set a proper estimate on human liberty? They have not, for every where among them, the *negro* is seen to be a *negro* still. In all the free states of the North, it is the same with this people; there is no real elevation of character beyond the power by which

they are surrounded, and this is the influence of the customs and manners of the white population.

'Twas on Euphrate's shore, confusion blent,
To build the tower, just as the flood was spent;
Whose architects were negroes, black and brown,
And brought upon their work the Eternal's frown.
So in the western world, old *Nimrod's* friends
Are building up a tower for certain ends,
On which 'tis written—Abolitionism:
Meaning wild disorder, or any kind of schism.
But God, who sees their work, may laugh to scorn,
And blast the parent ere the child is born.

FOURTEENTH SECTION.

Replies to various abolition questions proposed to the author—Circumstances in which men find themselves possessed of slaves beyond their control, which is held to be God's providence in securing negro slavery, in agreement with his decree by Noah—Difference of negro sensibilities from that of the whites, on being separated from wives and children, proven by facts—Argument of abolitionists in favor of negro equality, founded on God's having given the rule of all animals, as much to the blacks as to the whites, replied to—Ham and Nimrod's opposition to the religion of Noah, founded on their hatred to him, on account of the *curse*, who originated idolatry in the world—None but negroes engaged in the project of the tower—Happiness and well-being of the negro race seem to lie in the direction of the white man's control—Fates of all the ancient negro kingdoms—Different estimate of the negro, respecting human liberty and its uses, from the white man—The races set out, after the flood, with equal opportunities, but who has won the prize?—*Practical* undervaluing of the negro character by abolitionists—A curious position of abolitionists, which supposes the *hiring* out of the race of Ham to the other races would fulfill Noah's *curse*, replied to—A certain great objection of abolitionists to slavery, which charges owners of slaves of giving them no wages, replied to—The patriarch, nor did the Jew, pay slaves any wages as *hired* men, with many other matters.

DURING the time we have been occupied in producing this work, the question has been frequently asked the writer, if he does not consider it a Christian duty to enslave and hold in bondage, individuals of the African race, seeing that we build our whole belief in this matter upon the Divine Oracles? Therefore, say they, ought not Christian men, and all oth-

ers, to make the thing binding on their very consciences, and perseveringly assist in the accomplishment of so great a duty, as we should any and all injunctions of the Scriptures not abrogated. Our reply to this question is, that the Scriptures do not *command* the enslavement of the negro race, but they give a history of that people, in which is related the account of their being *cursed* by the mouth of Noah, and of the indorsement of that same curse in the law of Moses, *giving* the *right* and *privilege* to the races of Shem and Japheth to enslave them, if they will, in which practice not even the New Testament opposes any objection.

But, says one, if it was not a *command* that the two races of Shem and Japheth *should* enslave the race of Ham, how then could there be any certainty that the judicial decree of God, as announced by Noah, that they *should* be servants, be secured to take place? Our answer to this is, that the *commands* of God make nothing sure, as all men are free to disobey as they are free to obey; but the *decrees* of God are sure, without man's obedience or disobedience—the Deity taking care so to shape things and circumstances, that his veracity shall not be impeached. It is on *this* ground, and no other ground, that the judicial decree of God, respecting Ham and his posterity, was made sure to take place, which, as all the world knows, has been fulfilled, and will, doubtless, still continue to be thus fulfilled, in some shape or other, till the end of the world.

There can be no doubt but the chief means by which the Divine wisdom has secured the accom-

plishment of the personal enslavement of Ham's race, is the position they hold in relation to the other two races. The white and red men of the first ages, as well as the same races *now*, being actually of a more noble and intellectual description of *person* and *countenance*, overawe the more imbecile and cringing negro, who, on this account, *naturally* looks up for protection and support to the more conservative and powerful races of Shem and Japheth. This being so, which all men must acknowledge, they have *naturally* and *fortuitously* become slaves, in myriads of instances, and thus have secured the same fate to their offspring in perpetuity. In this position there is nothing that savors of sin, as it is but the weaker seeking protection of the stronger—it is the *natural* operation of circumstances, not to be avoided without much trouble and resistance. How many freed blacks there are in this country, who have gone again to their former masters, having found it impossible to take as good care of themselves free, as when slaves. But there are other ways in the mutations of society, occasioned by the revolution of nations, in which, as it relates to individuals, there is no sin to be charged upon them, though the negro race fall into their hands as personal slaves, which is under the direction of that Eye who will secure the accomplishment of his decrees.

As it respects the cases of millions of families in this and all countries, they find, as children and *heirs*, that they are in possession of black slaves, without their knowledge and consent, the same as the rest of inherited estates and property. So it may be that, in

most cases, where the negro man is found a slave, that some uncontrollable circumstance at *first* necessitated the purchase of the black man as a slave—thus securing, without sin, the servitude of millions. Africa herself, in all ages, has stood ready with her *billions* of slaves, to tempt the cupidity of men in their purchase, selling their own race for the merest trifle a head—*this* has always been done by their chiefs. In this, who is to blame? The negro is too ignorant and imbecile to be charged with sin, in the proper sense of the word, on this account; and the purchasers, what else could they do but take them when offered, as their condition in life could not be made worse by the transfer, but far better? Thus the Divine *Providence*, in an arbitrary manner, has taken care to accomplish its own judicial appointment of the negro race to slavery.

Abolitionists, in their opposition to the principle of negro slavery, contend that, as the Supreme Being dealt severely in the way of judgment, with the Egyptians, for refusing to let the Hebrews go free from their condition of bondage in that country; it is made clear, therefore, as they believe, that he is not pleased with the practice which enslaves the black race. But, between the two cases there appears to be no parallel—no likeness of condition—on which account, though God punished and rebuked the Egyptians for their behavior toward the Hebrews in that affair, yet this furnishes no reason why we are to believe that, therefore, *negro* slavery is against his will.

The Hebrews were sent from the land of Canaan

down to Egypt by God himself, where they were received as *citizens*, and placed in the richest part of the country, namely, in *Goshen*, as in the hollow of his hand, who preserved them there during four hundred years, till such time as he should be ready to return them again to the land of Canaan, as he had promised to Abraham; Gen. xv, 16. We do not learn from the Scriptures that the Hebrews, during their stay in Egypt, were slaves in the *abject* or *property* sense of the word, and that they were bought and sold as such among the Egyptians; but that they were *vassals* only, and were compelled to pay a heavy tax, in labor, to the government, which, toward the close of their stay in that country, became exorbitant in the extreme.

Respecting this labor, which they were compelled to render, it does not appear that it was exacted during the *whole* time they were in Egypt, but only toward the *end* of that sojourn. We come to the conclusion that they were not held as *personal* slaves, the same as negroes are in the southern states, because, it is seen from Exod. xii, 32, that they had vast herds of *flocks* and of *cattle*. If flocks and herds, then they had the possession and occupancy of *land*, which would also suppose *houses*, in which they dwelt, enjoying all the domiciliary appendages of society, governing themselves, yet in a tributary condition. That this was the fact, is shown from Exod. ix, 7, where it is written, that "Pharaoh *sent*, and behold, there was not *one* of the cattle of the *Israelites* dead." But to what place did Pharaoh send to find this out? To Goshen, the country which was given to the Israel-

ites, when they came *first* into Egypt, as is seen from Gen. xlvii, 4, 11; which Goshen was in the land of Ramases, the very best in the country of Egypt. If the Hebrews were actual *slaves*, as persons are who are bought and sold, then it was impossible for them to possess property, as land, houses, cattle, and herds, or to have maintained a system of *nobility* or *elder-ship*, which they certainly did, as appears from Exod. xii, 21, who at the very *time* of their oppression and of the plagues, lived in Goshen, as is evident from Exod. viii, 22. Had they been *slaves*, this could *not* have been, as people of *that* cast have no titles, or dignitaries, no nobility of any description, property, or social compacts, as the Hebrews had at the very *time* when Moses demanded their release from Pharaoh, and when he delivered them out of the country.

The bondage, therefore, to which they were subjected, was that of *vassalage*, and the payment of exorbitant *taxes*, required to be paid in labor, beyond their power to perform. It is very likely, that the persons who performed this labor, in making brick, were drawn out by *draughts*, so many from every hundred, and then sent to the king's works for a given time, and then returned again, when others were draughted in their turn. Had this not been so, the Hebrews could not have had possessions in the country, or maintained any form of society whatever, as they certainly did.

The Egyptians, from their earliest history, practiced buying and selling slaves of the property character, as is seen from the history of *Joseph*, who was

sold as a slave to an Egyptian, by the Ishmaelites, and from other sources. But the Hebrews came into Egypt, not as slaves, but as citizens, in full fellowship and equality with the lords of Egypt, in virtue of their relation to Joseph, the savior of Egypt in the days of the famine. We do not find that the Scriptures have blamed the Egyptians because they held the Hebrews in a condition of vassalage, but because they *abused* them, and would not let them go, when God called for them by the ministration of Moses. We see no parallel, therefore, between the condition of the Hebrews in Egypt, and the slavery of the negro race, as ordained from the lips of Noah, and from Mount Sinai.

Egypt was the house in which God saw fit to place the seed of Abraham, till such time as the nations of the land of Canaan should become ripe for destruction, when he intended to take the Hebrews away from the Egyptians, as he had promised Abraham; Gen. xv, 13, 14. The sojourn of the people of Israel in the country of Egypt, was not, therefore, a state of *bond slavery*, in which the Egyptians claimed and held them as their property, but only as a nation of vassals, providentially placed among them, who, on account of their rapid *increase* in the country oppressed them grievously, in order to keep them from becoming numerous, as appears from Exod. i, 9–11. Had they not been a body politic in Egypt, they could not have acquired wealth, so as to have left the country possessed of great substance, besides that which the Egyptians, in their fear, bestowed upon them, when they went out of the country, toward

the Red Sea. Egypt, it is true, is often alluded to in the Scriptures as having been the house of bondage to the Hebrews, and their condition while there, that of *bondmen*, yet of the vassal character, not *property slaves;* states of human being widely different from each other.

The United States, while under the yoke of Great Britain, was a condition of national *bondage*, but no man was a bond slave on that account, and yet, in PRINCIPLE, their condition was just the same with the Hebrews in Egypt, except the latter were more severely treated. There were many *reasons* why the Supreme Being saw fit to place the lineage of the Messiah in the condition the Hebrews endured in the country of Egypt; *one* of which was, that, thereby, occasion might arise for him to exhibit his power as the God of the *universe*, by which means the insignificance and nothingness of all other gods might be seen. The *judgments*, therefore, which were let loose in *ten* signal displays upon Egypt, as well as the death of many ten thousands in the Red Sea, were in pursuance of that *design*, as well, also, as to punish the haughty and cruel negro king of the Nile for not letting the Hebrews go, when they were called for by the God of the universe.

The rebuke, therefore, of the Egyptians, on that occasion, affords no argument in support of that opinion, that God was ever displeased with *negro slavery*, as, between the two cases, the *Hebrews* in *Egypt*, and the negroes under the *curse*, present no parallels to each other, as to the *reasons* or *principle of* the occurrences. If the argument which abolitionists

draw from that history and circumstance, is correct namely, that God is opposed to negro slavery, how came it to pass, in a few months after those awful displays of his power upon the Egyptians, that he gave a *permit* to the Hebrews to enslave the negro heathen people of old Canaan, in the very *law of Moses*, given from *Heaven* on Mount Sinai? If, as abolitionists say, God punished the Egyptians for holding the Hebrews in a state of slavery, and from that *alone*, how could he justify the enslaving of the Canaanite heathen immediately after? The idea is preposterous, irreconcilable and absurd. Thus falls to the ground, every argument and position which abolitionists conjure up from the Scriptures, which goes to contradict the decree of God on the negro question.

There is *one* trait among the incidents of negro slavery, upon which abolitionists fix their eye with an awful and fierce intensity, calling on all mankind to come and see the horrid sight; and this is the circumstance of separating the families of slaves, by their being sometimes sold to other masters. On this subject, abolitionists argue the same as they would were the case their own, imagining that negro parents feel such a circumstance as acutely, and as sentimentally as white families would under similar circumstances. But this is a mistake, as we believe, and does not apply to the negro's case, as it would to that of the whites, on account of a want of the higher intellectual faculties of the mind of the blacks. On occasions of severe bereavement, the feelings of negro parents seem to be of shorter duration; as it is well

known that the bond of marriage and family obligation with that race, is of but secondary considerations, or of slight influence, as a knowledge *of*, and a participation *in*, high intellectual love and elevated affections, is not reached by the black man's soul.

On this very account, the desire of promiscuous intercourse prevails in negro society far more than among the whites, and is carried out in their practice. The power of *this* trait of their constitutional make, no doubt operates in lessening their attachments to refined family endearments, so that when separated from each other by being sold, it is not so grievous a thing as it would be to the mind and feelings of a white man or woman.

This trait of the negro character was always thus, a striking proof of which is related by Herodotus, Vol. vi, p. 77, as follows: "At a certain time, when the Persians had the mastery of Egypt, there was a tribe who had revolted, and after an unsuccessful struggle against their conquerors, the male part of the population of their citadel or town, came to a resolution of secretly making their escape, leaving their families and kindred behind to look out for themselves, while they should reach, if possible, the Ethiopian country, that lay at the head of the Nile.

"But as soon as it was known to the Persians, they pursued the fugitives and soon came up with them, when a parley took place. The Persians endeavored to persuade the negroes to return, by alluding to their gods, their wives and children, from whom they were to be forever separated, if they persisted in their project.

But when this appeal was made, to the dearest sensibilities of the human mind, one of their number leaped out from the midst of his fellows, and in a loud stentorian voice, said, as he exposed himself improperly, wherever we go (*perveho* TALIS) more wives and more children can be obtained, when they took to their heels and were soon out of sight in the wilderness."

In agreement with this disposition, it is said by all travelers, and those acquainted with the true African negro character, that parents will sell their little children for almost any trifle, as a piece of *cloth*, a girdle of *beads*, a bottle of *wine* or *brandy*, or any *trinket* which strikes their fancy; and this they will do with the knowledge of the certain enslavement of their offspring.—"*Universal Traveler*," *page*, 404.

We know, it can be said, that the Jew would sell his child, but it was with the knowledge of its release in six years to freedom again. It may also be said, that the Circassians, who are white, will sell their daughters to the Turks, but this is done, not to enslave them, but to exalt them to the honor of being a member of some great man's harem—this is owing to their false education, not insensibility of nature.

But the negro man sells his *babe* as an *abject slave*, brutally, for almost no reward, never to see it again, the transaction taking place on the part of the negro parent with all the apathy and indifference they would sell a dog.

In all *this*, does it not appear that there is a difference between the affections of the two races toward

their offspring, and that the separating of *negro* parents from their children is not as grievous as abolitionists seem to believe?

This being true, in compliment to the ameliorating genius of the age, it were as well, perhaps, to *discourage* occurrences of the kind—it would be more patriarchal and fatherly.

It is not very likely that Ham and his family were very well pleased with the curse and denunciation of Noah, which put them, with all who should proceed from their house, under the ban of everlasting servitude to the races of their brethren. This circumstance, beyond all doubt, raised up in the minds of that people, an unconquerable hatred, not only toward *Noah*, but also toward *Shem* and *Japheth*, with their entire posterities, in those ages.

On this account, it was that Ham left the *paternal* tents and *altar* of sacrifice, near Ararat, much sooner than did the other sons, wandering still further down the Euphrates toward the sea, till they came to the great flats of *Shinar*, where Nimrod, the grandson of Ham, commenced the foundation of his empire, and where he, with Ham and all the race, set about building the *tower*, as a defense against another flood, and as a temple of *idolatry* and a rallying point for their tribes in coming ages. It was, no doubt, on the account of Noah's curse that Nimrod, the great leading spirit, like Satan among the fallen angels, opposed himself so cruelly with all his power, to the religion of Noah, as propagated by *Shem*, who was Melchisedek His grand object was to produce and consolidate a power by which to protect

his race against the threatened servitude of Noah, his grand-sire, announced in the curse, as well as to establish a contrary system of religion, which would subserve the same end.

At the time of the confusion of the language, there was none of the races of Shem and Japheth there; that operation—the building of the tower—was wholly of negro invention, who had the requisite geometrical knowledge at the time, derived from the house of Noah, who brought this knowledge, with all other, from beyond the flood. On this account, for some hundred years, the first people of those countries had more scientific knowledge than the nations, many of them, had a thousand years afterward.

But, how is it known that the races of Shem and Japheth did not participate in the wicked project of the tower? It is shown from the *natural* antipathy of the children of Shem toward the blacks, and also from its being an *idolatrous* temple, or tower, from which the descendants of Shem and Japheth would turn with horror, especially while Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, and others of the patriarchs of the holy line, were yet alive, and the dictators of the religion and morals of the people.

Josephus says, in his Jewish Antiquities, p. 19, that Nimrod was a bold man and of great muscular strength. The Jewish Rabbi say, also, in their tradition, that he was a mighty giant, and of a morose, cruel and savage temper, a tyrant among his people, who forced men from the fear of God, threatening to be revenged on God for destroying the world by water. Moses says he was a mighty hunter before the

Lord; to which the Rabbi add, that he not only hunted and destroyed the wild animals which abounded beyond measure in that early age, but that he also killed men, unless they would unite with him against God and the religion of Noah.

That the blacks of that age and of the house of Nimrod were violent persecutors of the race and religion of Shem and Noah, as related by Josephus, is supported by a *Persian tradition*, which says that they having, at a certain time, got into their hands a child of the family of *Terah*, which was *Abraham*, they cast it into a strong fire. But when they looked to see it writhe and agonize in the flames, behold, the place of the fire had become a *hedge of roses*, in full bloom, where the infant lay embedded, as on a couch of down formed of those flowers.

NIMROD, *Ham*, and coadjutors, therefore, were the great fathers of idolatry in the world *after* the flood, who inducted the people into their system of religion by combining the indulgence of one of the strongest passions of animal nature with the worship of the gods, making such indulgence one of the chief virtues, because, from this indulgence proceeded the human race, as they believed, by which means the world was peopled—a religion in exact agreement with the naturally obscene propensities of the negro race.

In the bosom of a negro man, the idea of liberty, freedom and independence, does not give rise to the same *sensations*, hopes, and expectations, that it does in the bosom of the whites. To the mind of a slave, or even of a free black man, with but small excep-

tion, the idea of liberty is but the idea of a holyday, in which they are to be let loose from all restraint or control; they are to play, work, or sleep, as may suit their inclination, following out, to the utmost, the perfect indulgence of indolence, stupidity, and the animal passions.

But to the mind of the white man, *liberty* is the means of the moral and physical improvement of himself and race; it is the *field* of labor, out of which will arise, as wheat from the seed, a harvest of *knowledge*, intellectual refinement, well ordered society, the advancement of the arts and sciences, government of the passions, with every good thing that can charm the elevated mind and conduce to the bliss of human existence. The races set out with equal opportunities, at the subsiding of the flood, but who has won and taken the prize of power—of social and mental improvement.

It cannot be denied, that, to the perceptions of a white man, the negro's case is a hard one, and was fully foreknown to the Creator, who is merciful and kind; yet he did not see fit *not* to create them, and to create them in the loins of Ham, a *degraded* race, as well as to appoint them to *servitude*, while the father of the race was yet alive. If the hard lot of this people affords at present a reason why they should be set free, such as are in slavery, it can be said in reply, that the *same reason* existed at first, in the eye of the Divine foresight, with all the force that it does now.

Such a course, however, namely, *not* to create them, did not please the Maker, as it was agreeable to him

that they should exist, and exist as we find them, a race totally different from the whites, in every respect that can be thought of, except that they are *human*, but of the lowest order, and eminently adapted to a state of servitude.

But, says an abolitionist, we do not disagree to the African race being *servants*, if *they* desire it—that is, *hired* servants—as in *this* way the Scriptures, or word of prophesy by Noah, can as well be fulfilled as that the race should be *slaves*. To this position we reply, that it is extremely short-sighted; as he who *hires* himself out to labor is not a slave *servant*, in any sense of the word, but is a *free man*, having, at his *own* will, disposed of his *labor*, not of his body, as he saw fit. The Scriptures, in the law of Moses, make a great distinction between a *slave* and a *hired* man. See Levit. xxv, 39, 40, where it is written as follows: "Thou shalt not *compel* him [a Hebrew] to serve as a *bond servant*, but as a *hired* servant." But, notwithstanding the discriminating remark of Moses, abolitionists can discover no difference in the two cases, confounding them together, because they *will*, and not because they do not *know* better. Were *this* the way in which the spirit of God directed Noah to *curse* the race of Ham with servitude, and the way in which he intended its fulfillment, namely, that they were generally to *hire* themselves out to work for other people, then it would follow that this *curse* applied as much to both the other races as it did to Ham's race; for there are found as many laborers among the other races, and especially the whites, who work on *hire*, as among the blacks, and a thousand

times as many, as they are a more industrious people. Surely, the Supreme Being could never have intended to call a man *cursed* because he should *hire* himself out to labor: there must be, therefore, some *worse* meaning attached to the idea of a *bond* servant, than the hiring of one's self out. On *this* view of the subject, *bond* service cannot be made out, as personal *bondage* supposes the holding of our bodies as property; consequently, when Moses said to the Hebrews, that if they wanted *bondmen* and *bondmaids*, who were to serve them *forever*, they were to *buy* them—not hire them—of the *heathen*, and to hold them by compulsion, as a possession for themselves and their children after them, which they could not do with a hired man.

From *this* view of the subject, it is easy to perceive that the arguments of abolitionists entirely neutralize the force of the denunciation of Noah, respecting Ham's race, causing it to refer as much to *one people* as to *another*, who may chance to *hire* themselves out to labor, making it a *curse* to do so, and they who do it a *cursed race*. Is not this a fair result of their position?

But, says an abolitionist, *we* do not believe that the curse of Noah signified or related, in any sense, to such a thing as the *personal* bondage of any of the race of Ham, with a view to their bodily enslavement; that curse, we hold, was wholly of a *national* character, and was fulfilled, as it related to *Shem's* rule, when the Jews subdued old Canaan; and, as to *Japheth's* rule, when the white nations, under Alexander, destroyed old Tyre and Zidon, with other negro

countries, putting them under tribute and *national* servitude.

To this, as to the other problem, we must reply, that it will not do, as, by *this* mode of interpretation, all the other nations of the earth, who have alternately subdued each other by war, policy, or stratagem, and laid one another under vassalage and tribute, are, therefore, equally *cursed* with the Race of Ham, as to the quintescence of the thing, as it was no *worse* for the negro Canaanites to be put under vassalage and tribute, than any other people, so that *they* were no more under a Divine curse than any of the rest of mankind when conquered. Wherefore, in *this* way of explaining the text, abolitionists make it void and indefinite, as to its particular application, which the whole history, as written by Moses in the ninth chapter of Genesis, disallows.

There is but *one* way remaining to give that scripture, Gen. ix, as well as the clause in the law, Levit. xxv, a consistent meaning; and that is to allow that *both* recognized the individual and bodily slavery of the race of Ham by the two other races—the circumstance of their paying tribute, at any time, as a people, to other nations who might conquer them, having nothing to do toward the fulfillment of that denunciation of Noah, as that decree related not to national, but to individual slavery. If this is not the true sense of those passages, and especially that of Gen. ix, 25–27, it would remain, as yet, uncertain whether that curse or decree has been in any degree fulfilled.

The fond idea, or we may say the fanaticism and

foolish notion of abolitionists, which supposes the *hiring out* of the race of Ham, at their *own* discretion, to the other races, falls, therefore, to the ground, so far as it relates to the fulfilling of the curse of Noah upon the posterity of *Ham*, his youngest, but wretchedly profligate, son. Thus, having disposed of the foregoing objections and positions of abolitionists, we now address ourself to combat another error of their creating. This is, the circumstance of the slaves laboring, as they say, for *no reward* or wages; and, therefore, slavery is not according to the principle of *eternal rectitude*, but is a sin of the blackest dye.

Now, do not frown, dear reader, when we tell you that this is not true of slavery, as slaves do not labor without a hope of reward; and that reward they generally receive. It is true, however, that their wages is not as *much* as many other laborers obtain, and then again, it is much *more* than many receive who are not slaves. The laboring classes of men over the whole earth, and among all people, operate under very different circumstances, which has been the case in all ages, and will continue to be thus to the end of time. In all countries, *minors*, apprentices and *children*, labor till of age, for no other *reward* than their food, shelter and clothing. In millions of cases, men labor all their lives, and never receive anything more than their food and raiment, and yet, they were not bondmen, but free. Do not black slaves receive as much as this, and is not this a *reward* to which they look with all the eagerness of any other kind of laborers? Do they not hail the hours of meal times as the bright spot of their destiny, with as much joy

as do other laborers? The clothes they receive, are they not better far than their original nakedness in the wilds of Africa? Who rewarded them then?

Millions of free men over the whole earth, do not receive as much wages as do the negroes of the slave states in America; but, with their freedom, actually *starve* to death, even in England and her dependencies, not from idleness, but from oppression. Among freemen, how many beggars do we meet with, who have received no wages? But among negro slaves there are no beggars. Food and raiment is all that a man can receive on the earth, which is as sure to a negro slave as to the rest, and is the whole reward of animal labor and of animal existence. The rich, though they *control* more than they can individually consume, have, in reality, nothing, after all, more than a slave, except injurious and ruinous luxuries. Wherefore, as it respects mere physical existence, slaves are on a perfect level with the rest of mankind, which is not only philosophically, but scripturally, true; for Solomon says, Eccl. vi, 7, that "*all* the labor of man is for his *mouth*," which is his portion and *reward* under the sun.

Negro slavery, therefore, on that account, is not contrary to the principle of Eternal rectitude. It is true, however, that their hope of speculation is not as great as it is among the whites; yet the amount, upon the whole, which they receive, is just the same, as their food, raiment and shelter are made much surer to them, especially in Christian countries, than among the free blacks. The servitude of the race of Ham, to the latest era of mankind, is necessary to the

veracity of God himself, as by it is fulfilled *one* of the eldest of the decrees of the Scriptures, namely, that of Noah, which placed the race as servants under the other races. This is noticed by *Newton* in the same light, which *has* been, and *now* is, being every where fulfilled, with all the punctuality that all the other decrees are, and have been, fulfilled; and should convince all abolitionists of their unavailing error, in opposing this great and nearly most ancient decree of the Divine Oracles.

God is *just* and *good*, in the adaptation of circumstances to the well-being of every creature of the earth, which is as manifest in the negro's case as in the case of every other grade of animal being. If the white man is more intellectual than a negro, so much the more are his *cares* and *responsibilities*. On this principle, we notice, that in the negro character is fixed, as a kind of antidote or recompense for slavery, a certain disposition to *levity*, peculiar to themselves, which takes off much of the weight of their seeming sorrows. THIS enables them *more* cheerfully to endure, without *thought*, their condition of servitude. One trait of this peculiar character of the negroes is, their fondness of singing and whistling, in which they universally indulge, even under circumstances which would make a white man weep. They generally have voices of the most melodious character, and can whistle with their *thick lips*, better than all mankind beside, in the sounds of which they forget all things else, rejoicing in the lightness and levity of their peculiar natures. Who has not witnessed *this*, that has seen and noticed this people at all?

Thus mercifully is thrown into the negro's being, circumstances which go to make his condition tolerable, though created black and doomed to servitude, rendering him, upon the whole, not less happy than are the other races of men.

Thus, with balanced eye, the great All-seeing
Has made each race with an equal being—
Has with the ills of life some blessing mix'd,
Though in our grades a *gen'ral* state is fix'd.
The white man soars, as with an eagle's flight,
While the black man dips in the wave of night;
And both, rejoicing in their sev'ral spheres,
Should offer thanks in the Eternal's ears.

FIFTEENTH SECTION.

That the Gospel doctrines and their tendencies is against negro slavery, as asserted by abolitionists, shown to be a mistake—Examination of the golden rule of our Savior, in relation to this matter—That the condition of slaves among the Jews was a condition of comparative comfort, as is asserted by abolitionists, refuted—Care of slaves, as far back in time as the days of *Job* and *Abraham*—The subject of *judicial* law and the law of *love* examined, in relation to negro slavery, and are found to harmonize—The great and stronghold of abolitionism in support of negro equality, and the propriety of amalgamation by marriages, founded on God's striking *Miriam*, the sister of Moses, with leprosy, because she found fault with her brother for having married an Ethiopian woman, overturned and shown to be blasphemous—Curious fact of the blood of the negro race being guarded against, as affecting the blood of the line through which the Messiah was to come—First preaching of the Gospel directed to the *countries* inhabited by white men, not negroes—This was done afterward—All the present arts of the world nearly of white men's invention, not negro's, with many other deeply interesting subjects.

In the following pages, we are to meet a few more objections of abolitionism, as well as present the reader with some other matters, when we shall finish the labor of this work. It is said, by this class of men, that the *benevolence* of the Gospel contemplates the personal happiness of every human being; and as *individual freedom* is an item in the sum of mortal enjoyments, therefore, the Gospel, in its *spirit* and tendencies, is against slavery of every description, and demands its abolishment.

But, we answer this position, by saying, that, although the spirit and tendencies of the Christian religion most assuredly does contemplate the entire and perfect *moral* happiness of the whole human race, upon certain *conditions*, as obedience to its commands, &c., yet it does *not*, and *cannot* interfere, as we have before said, with the *judgments*, *decrees*, or *judicial* acts of God, until the *purposes* of such acts are accomplished in the earth. Although the Gospel, as announced in the New Testament, is a message of benevolence from Heaven toward the sufferers of the earth, yet *death* is not, and cannot be counteracted, as yet, by its influence, because death came by the appointment or judicial act of God, on the account of *sin*, placing the direful circumstance *beyond* the redeeming nature of that great system of atonement. Neither can it affect matters of less importance, such as the circumstance of man's being *compelled* by a *Divine judgment* to get his bread in the sweat of his face, with pain, toil, and uncertainty. The case of the woman, who was placed by the *same* power, *judicially*, in a certain circumstance, which is that of great pain and danger, is also placed beyond the reach of the benevolence of the spirit of the Gospel, because she hearkened to the voice of the serpent, in the matter of the forbidden tree. Does the Gospel, and its benevolent *principles*, remove one item of the vast amount of what is called *natural evil*, which the human race now is heir to, such as sickness, poverty, accidents, mistakes, difference of men's opinions, which are all the effects of the *judicial* proceedings of the Creator toward man, on the account of *sin*.

Now, if the *spirit* and *tendencies* of religion, can not, as yet, remove these disabilities or obstacles to man's happiness in this world, how, therefore, can it be expected that it can alter the doom of the negro race, which, as the Bible establishes, is founded on the same foundation, that of the decree of God, and raises a barrier which is impassable and insurmountable to all earthly power: even the famous words of our Lord called the *Golden Rule*, cannot apply *here*. Neither does this rule appear with power to break down any *civil* establishment of society; it was not so intended or understood, by the first disciples and writers of the New Testament. It was not intended by that great and good doctrine, that *servants* and *masters*, *debtors* and *creditors*, *rich* and *poor*, should change condition, or even to be put on a *par* with each other by that precept of the Lord. It signified nothing more than that all men, under *all* circumstances of trouble, should do by each other in all kindness, just what they would reasonably desire done to themselves in like circumstances. This precept, therefore, was not meant to reach the case of slavery, as to its *abolishment*, any more than it was the other cases, as above named. It enjoined on masters to extend to servants, minors, and slaves all needed tenderness and consideration, as they themselves could *reasonably* desire were they in a like condition.

The patriarch Job did *thus* toward his slaves, and *no more*, see chapter xxxi, 13, where he says, that he did not "despise the *cause* of his man or maid servant," and yet he did not *manumit* them, after all. It

will not answer to extend that rule to extremes, as by persevering in such a course, we should unhinge all the regulations of society, at the voice of every complaint, effecting nothing but a continued change of circumstances, from one extreme to another, without adding a whit to the comfort of any body permanently.

Abolitionists contend, in their publications and lectures, that the condition of bondmen among the Jews, was a condition of comparative comfort and equality with their masters, and that the law of Moses made it so. But we have never been able to discover this, while we have found the entire contrary. On this subject, the statement of *Adam Clarke* may have some weight, as no man on the earth was better informed respecting Oriental manners in those ages. See his comment on the passage above quoted, from *Job* xxxi, 13, as follows: "In *ancient times, slaves* had *no* action at law against their masters; they might dispose of them as they did their cattle or any other property. The slave might complain, and the master might hear him if he pleased, but he was not compelled to do so. Job states that *he* admitted them, however, to civil rights, and far from preventing their case from being heard, he was ready to *permit* them to complain, even against himself, and to give them all the benefit of the law." Job was a righteous man, and in that thing did right; and yet we do not learn that he set his slaves *free*. Let every slaveholder do the same. Josephus states, Antiquities of the Jews, book 4, p. 130, that slaves were not allowed to be witnesses in any court.

From all this, it appears that the case of the negro slaves of those times, and among the Jews in particular, was in no wise superior, if it was as good, as in America, except in such cases as when they fell into the hands of men as good as were Job and Abraham. Consequently, the notion that the slaves of the Jews, under the law of Moses, was a comfortable condition of life, as held by abolitionists, falls to the ground, as does most of their doctrines and positions.

It is affirmed by abolitionists, that because God, at *first* and prior to the fall, and as soon as he had created man, said, that every thing which was made, was *very good*, that, therefore, negro man was made equal with white men. But this comment of theirs fails, when it is recollected that there was, at that time, no negroes in existence, nor never would have been, had not God have seen fit to produce them, about one thousand five hundred and fifty-six years after the original creation of man, in the way and manner already described on the first pages of this work, and soon after to appoint him to slavery.

It has been urged upon the attention of the writer of this work, by abolitionists, that we ought seriously to examine the difference there is between *Judicial law* and *Divine law*, in relation to the enslaving negro men in ancient times. The judicial law, said that the Jews might buy and possess slaves, but the Divine law says, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Is slavery consistent with this Divine law?

In answer to this question, we dare not array these two laws against each other, seeing they are both of the same origin. We think it were a much safer

course to say, that these laws, so different in their effects, have a high regard for each other and do not encroach upon their respective powers and applications.

Judicial law requires *execution*, and the law of love *delights* in mercy; but till an equivalent is paid down, mercy can do nothing. Now who has redeemed the negro race from the curse of Noah and the force of that judicial law? It has never been done.

The law of love says, love thy neighbor as thyself. But who is our neighbor? We answer, that our neighbors are of various descriptions, and the *Divine law* says, love them all, in their respective characters, whether slaves or free, rich or poor, wise or simple, learned or unlearned, black, white or red, good or bad, and all this without politically meddling with their domestic affairs.

The Supreme Being having seen fit to adjudge the negro race to a condition of servitude among men, are we not, therefore, bound to believe that this adjudication is not contrary or inconsistent with the law of *love* as it relates to man; as we see that we may love a slave in the religious sense of the word, and yet have nothing to do with his *state* of bondage, unless we have an inclination to manumit them if they are our own property; but there is *no law* which requires this, whether judicial or Divine, or it would have been noticed by St. Paul, when he had the subject of negro slavery under his pen, upon which we have already treated in a former section of this work.

There is another argument to answer, which is

brought forward by abolitionists in favor of the equality of negroes with white men, and in favor of the amalgamation of these two races. This argument of theirs is founded on the twelfth chapter of Numbers, one of the books of the Decalogue, or the laws of Moses. But before we enter upon an investigation of that chapter, in relation to the doctrine alleged by abolitionists, we will merely observe, that they are a strange set of *logicians*, inasmuch as when the law of Moses is appealed to as an evidence of the *legal* enslaving of the negro Canaanites, then that law is found to be *antiquated*, out of date, and of *no* force; but when, in the *same law*, there happens to be found a passage that seems to make in favor of any of the dogmas of abolitionism, *lo*, it is seized upon with avidity, and held to be of the greatest force and authority, and by no means antiquated, or inefficient, being first rate Scripture.

The chapter alluded to, reads as follows: "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses, because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married, for he had married an Ethiopian woman. And they said, hath the Lord indeed spoken *only* by Moses? hath he not spoken also by *us?* And the Lord heard it. * * * And the Lord spake suddenly unto Moses, and unto Aaron, and unto Miriam: come out ye *three* unto the tabernacle of the congregation; and they came out. And the Lord came down in the pillar of a cloud and stood in the door of the tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam, and they both came forth. And he said, hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I, the Lord, will make my-

self known unto him in a *vision*, and will speak to him in a dream, my servant Moses is not *so*, who is faithful in all my house. With *him* will I speak *mouth* to *mouth*, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold; wherefore, then, were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them; and he departed. And the cloud departed from off the tabernacle, and behold, Miriam became leprous, white as snow; Aaron looked upon Miriam, and behold, she was leprous. And Aaron said unto Moses, alas! my Lord, I beseech thee, lay not this sin upon us, wherein we have done foolishly, and wherein we have sinned.* * * * And Moses cried unto the Lord, saying: heal her now, O God, I beseech thee. And the Lord said unto Moses, if her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days, and after that let her be received again? And Miriam was shut out from the camp seven days, and all the people journeyed not till Miriam was brought in again."

On examining this chapter, does it appear on *what* account Miriam was made a loathsome leper, and driven out of the camp—was it for finding fault with her brother Moses, for marrying the black woman, or because she had joined with *Aaron* and others, in doubting whether God had indeed spoken *only* by Moses? It appears that her crime consisted *wholly* of the *latter*, which was for invading by contentious words, the divine dictatorship of Moses, to the exclusion of all others, over the twelve tribes.

In her punishment, God said not a word about the

woman Moses had married, nor respecting Miriam's having found fault with the marriage, but confined his remark wholly to the subject of the mission of Moses, as God's mouth to the people, as is seen by referring to the sixth, seventh and eighth verses of that chapter. There is no doubt, however, but the circumstance of her brother's having married one of the cursed race, was one of *her* reasons why he ought not to possess alone the dignity of being sole dictator. The circumstance, as *she* seems to have thought, was degrading, on which account she found fault with him, as reads the first verse of the chapter.

That the Hebrews were not to marry with the negroes of Canaan, is evident from Deut. vii, 3, and reads as follows: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them (the Canaanites): thy daughter shalt thou not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou not take unto thy son." Here, it is plain that the law of Moses forbids amalgamation of the Jew blood with that of the negro's; and yet abolitionists contend, that God, who was the author of that law, struck Miriam with a loathsome disease in token of his anger at her, because she found fault with the very thing the law found fault with and forbid.

This view of the matter is sufficient to convince any man that the crime of Miriam was not about the marriage but the sacred office of Moses only.

But says one, an abolitionist perhaps, the writer in this opinion of his, has got himself into a tangle at last, as we cannot see but he is compelled to show up Moses as a flagrant sinner against his own law, for having married that Ethiopian woman. Not so is

our reply, for Moses did that thing some forty years before the time the law was given to him from Mount Sinai, at a time when he knew no more of the will and law of God than any other man, who had been born and brought up among the Egyptians. But when he received the law, then he became informed of the will and designs of God, in that, as well as in all other matters.

As to the fate of the woman he had married in the land of Midian, at the time he fled from Egypt for killing an Egyptian, see Exo. ii, 12, we learn nothing from the Scriptures further than that she came to the Jewish camp, with Jethro her father, in the wilderness.

Thus it is certainly clear, that the abolition opinion, of the equality of negroes with other men, and the propriety and righteousness of amalgamation by marriage with them derives no support from that portion of Holy Writ, but receives a rebuke of the most decided description from the very law itself.

Respecting this race, we find that God took particular care that their blood should not become mingled with the line through which the Messiah was to come. This is a remarkable fact. To prove this, see Gen. xxxviii, the whole chapter, where is related the history of *Judah's* having had three sons by a Canaanitish woman, who, of course, was a negress. Two of these sons were slain by the Lord for a certain wickedness they did, while the third son, *Shelah* by name, escaped (Gen. xxxviii, 7, 10), but is not reckoned in the line of the holy seed, which was continued through another branch of Judah's blood,

book of Deuteronomy, chapter vii, verse 3, and onward, as well as the book of Joshua, chapter xxiii, 12, 13, where it was strictly forbidden, under the displeasure of Jehovah himself, to every individual of the twelve tribes of the Jews to *marry* with *any* of the *Canaanitish race*, which consisted of *seven* mighty nations, all of whom are set forth by name in this same seventh chapter of Deuteronomy.

Now, if *Rahab* had been of that *race*, and belonged by *blood* to any of those *seven* nations, SOLOMON, would not, as a *prince* of the tribe of *Judah*, have been allowed to have had this woman for a wife. Rahab, therefore, was of the blood of *Shem*, and but a citizen of the country, as *an inhabitant* only—while by *race*, she possessed no consanguinity to the blood of Ham.

Solomon, as a prince of the *regal* line of Judah, of which tribe came our Lord, could not have violated the law of Moses, in so flagrant and horrid a manner, as to have married a black woman, a Canaanitess; and thus to have provoked the vengeance of the God of Abraham, which is everywhere threatened, as often as the subject is alluded to in all the books of the law. *Thus*, we defend, as *we* believe, our opinion, which asserts that the blood of the negro race did not at all mix with the lineal blood of the Savior of Mankind.

Now, as we find this grand interdiction, respecting Jewish intermarriages with any and all the seven negro nations of Canaan—we may with the utmost propriety, believe in addition, that the interdiction extended to the *whole race*, settled in other countries, beside old Canaan, as it would have been equally

deleterious and corrupting to the sacred descent of Jesus Christ, to have been connected with the blood of negroes *out* of Canaan, as *within* that country.

But in the whole book of God, there is no command either direct or implied, against Jewish marriages, whether *before* or after the giving of the law of Moses, with the race of *Japheth*, the progenitor of the *white* race of mankind. And although Jesus Christ is the *proffered* Savior of all the human race, blacks and all, yet was it abhorrent to God, as we believe, that the *immaculate* blood of his Son, which was to be offered as an *atonement*, should be contaminated by that of negro extraction.

It is a remarkable fact, which, in connection with the above, cannot fail to make due impression on the reader's mind, that persons who had *flat noses* could not be a priest of the sanctuary of the Mosaic worship; see Leviticus xxi, 18. This regulation was, doubtless, to guard the blood of the priesthood from any contamination of the race of Ham, as a prominent feature of that people, is a *flat nose.* There was never a king nor prophet of the *Jews* who had negro blood in his veins; and yet there were multitudes of the Jews, as well as the Israelites, who were thus tinctured by unlawful connections with the Canaanites, which was against the law of Moses, as well as the law of nature.

It is a singular fact, that all the first labors of the apostles, after the resurrection of Christ, were directed northward from Jerusalem, among the whites, and not southward in Africa. To the north, in Italy, was the place of the throne of the Roman empire; to the

north lay all the Grecian tribes, among whom Paul and his associates went preaching the Gospel. Is not this a proof of the superiority of the white blood above that of the African? or these first missionaries would not have thus chosen that race as the conservators of the new system of divinity, given to the world by Jesus Christ.

In accordance with this view, we notice that the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, were given to the protection of the *white race*, and by them have been preserved and handed down to the present time. The New Testament, in particular, has been preserved by the white race after the age of the apostles, as the *Jews* deride that part of the Scriptures as false, and the African had nothing to do with its original preservation or compilation.

Abolitionists say that negro slavery is a curse upon earth, and that the curse of God is on the country and families wherever the thing is practiced; and yet we find in the Scriptures, Gen. ix, that when God, by the mouth of Noah, blessed Shem and Japheth, he gave them as *one* item in their *blessings*, a *right* to make servants of the race of *Ham*. It was the same with the Hebrews many hundred years after under the reign of Moses, as a law giver, when God promised his blessings upon them as a people, upon condition of their obedience, making one item of those blessings to be the privilege of enslaving the Canaanites.

If to hold slaves is a *curse* to any man or country, as abolitionists says it is, then *principles* must have strangely changed in the administration of God's

Providence since the days of Abraham; for to him the possession of bond men and bond maids was *one* item in the great amount of the *mercies* and *blessings* of God to that patriarch, in whose seed all the families of the earth were to be blessed. See Gen. xxiv, 35, as follows: "And the Lord hath blessed my master (Abraham) greatly, and he is become great, and hath given him flocks and herds, and silver and gold, and *man servants* and *maid servants*, and camels and asses."

But Abraham did *right* by his slaves, of whom he owned vast numbers; on which account the blessing of having bondmen was not changed to a *curse*, as are all the mercies of God when *abused* by the wicked. How, therefore, is it true, as abolitionist say, that the enslaving of the race originated in the foulest wickedness? It is not true, never was and never will be, except in the *abuse* of the institution.

With the *origin* of slavery, the present existing slaveholding population of the United States, had nothing to do—therefore, for that they are not to be held accountable. They did not bring the blacks from their native land, either by purchase or as prisoners of war. They came into existence with them in their possession, the same as their landed estates and every other species of property which they inherited from their fathers, and are, therefore, under the Divine supervision, morally and politically bound to protect and shield them from all physical suffering, the same as they are bound to protect and shield their children, apprentices, or other dependants. In this, the kind Providence of that all-wise Being, who rules

among the inhabitants of the earth, is benevolently displayed toward the descendants of Ham in North America. The experience of the blacks themselves, and the observation of all others, prove this to be their most happy condition; for, with but few exceptions, all those who have gone out from this protection, are found among the most miserable of the human family. All experience proves that were the principles of abolitionism carried out *practically*, the slaves would be placed in an infinitely worse condition, both morally and physically, than that in which we now find them.

But, says the objector, this is the white man's fault, for if the negro man and woman were but received into society upon an equal footing, with the whites, they would become their equals. This is granted, they would indeed become the equal of the white man. But how? not by the elevation, morally, mentally and physically, of the black man, but of the complete *degradation* of the white man, as the God who created both races has decreed, and as is manifest from the *difference*, the *radical difference*, there is between them, proving that their amalgamation cannot be effected, but by a loathsome deterioration of the superior race. This the experience of all time abundantly demonstrates, as well as that *amalgamation* is the inevitable result of political equality of the races.

Look, for example, at the population of the Mexican states. Not only is it characterized by *physical* weakness, but by *moral* and *mental inferiority* of a most frightful description. And how is this to be

accounted for? From the fact that there has been a mixture of Mexican and negro blood for ages. God forbid, therefore, that we as a people, should seek to elevate this race by so great a sacrifice, by so horrible a violation and prostration of the sacred laws of the Creator of the Universe. In all this we do not disparage the black man, but only set forth the actual difference there is between the races, neither of which are to be praised or censured respecting the attributes of their respective natures. These were wisely ordained by that Being who created all things, by the counsel of his own will, and the wisdom of whose appointments man has not the right to question.

There is another evidence, that the habitations of this race (the blacks) are of Divine appointment, and that is, that they are suited in their formation and physical constitution, to a *torrid* region. As the torrid region of North America is, therefore, best suited to their comfort and happiness, we conclude it is their natural home. And, as this country, through the providence of God, has been put into the power and ownership of the *white race*, and as the two races cannot exist together in a state of political equality, it follows that if the negro race exist in the South at all, as a people, it must be in a condition of *surveillance* or subordination of some sort or other.

The negro man has as good a right to *exist* as has the white man: but he has not as good a right to *rule* or give laws to society. This is evident from the black man's *mental* inferiority, and consequent *inability* to discharge those high functions, as the history

of the past and the observation of the present, abundantly prove.

This being true, we find that his place on the earth is that of *serveillance* of some description or other; and as the hand that formed them is good and munificent in his provisions and appointments for the comfort and support of all his creatures, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that a condition of this character is the most conducive to the well being and happiness of the negro race.

But, says one, that one human being should become, under any circumstances whatever, the property of another human being, is abhorrent to all the conceptions of the human mind relative to what is right or wrong. On this subject, we may argue thus, and not become obnoxious to the charge of *sophistry*, as we fondly hope. It is the *labor* which a serving man or woman can perform, that makes them at all valuable in the affairs of men. When a slave is transferred from one possessor to another, the *labor* which said slave may reasonably be considered capable of performing, is the *consideration* of *value* that is taken into the account, and not the mere body of the servant. How differs then a transaction of this kind from those which are of daily occurrence in every civilized community, viz: the hiring of one individual to another to *labor* a specified time for a stipulated amount? The difference consists alone in the *terms*, not in the *nature*, of the transaction; for, in either case, it is the labor of the individual that constitutes the thing of value. In the one case, the hireling receives for his services a stipulated sum of money; in the

other, the slave has secured to him, by the laws of the land, the necessaries and comforts of life, consisting of food, raiment, protection, &c. (Give them their liberty, emancipate them and place them upon their own resources, and all experience proves that not *one* in *ten* is capable of providing themselves and their families with the necessaries of life.) In either case the laboring faculty cannot be separated from the body of the laborer; therefore, it becomes necessary that the person of the servant should be present where the labor is required to be performed.

But, continues the objector, suppose it does not suit the serving man to go where the *labor* is required to be performed, is he to be forced to go against his will? To this we answer, that his is a *necessitous* condition, and that in yielding to the laws of imperious necessity, he is doing nothing more, is making no greater sacrifices, than is a large majority of the *whole human* family compelled, by the same laws of necessity, to make, whether they will to do it or not. All are more or less governed by overruling circumstances, and although there may be and there is a great variety of necessities accompanying the various conditions of human life, yet are they equally as imperious and often more severe and uncompromising, than are the commands of the master of a slave.

Indeed, it is a fact that cannot be denied, that the average condition of the slave population of the United States, is superior to that, not alone of the manufacturing population of Great Britain and the great masses of European nations generally, and of Mexico, but of a very numerous class of the free white popu-

lation of the free States of North America. If then, the philanthropic (?) votaries of abolitionism desire a field in which to exercise their feelings of charity and benevolence, they have it in their own midst, without hazarding any changes of climate or opposition of conflicting interests. Charity is a Christian virtue, a heavenly principle, and one which we wish to see practiced to the utmost ability of every member of the human family; but, under the guidance of modern abolitionists, it reminds us of him who could discern a *mote* in his brother's eye, without ever having discovered the *beam* in his own. We hope our neighbors of this class, will cast a glance *around* them, before they attempt to scan the sunny regions of the South.

Mexico, we are told, is a free country; "the hateful stigma of *slavery* attaches not to that delectable region of the earth." But this is a mistake: a system of slavery and beggarly oppression, of the most revolting character, has existed in that country from time immemorial. All that class of citizens who are not landholders, are compelled to labor for their daily subsistence. The wages which they receive for their services, are so small that they are forced from *necessity* to go in debt for the comforts of life. Not being able to liquidate those debts according to agreement, they are, in accordance with the laws of the country, sold to work until their debts are paid. But, as their wants always exceed their wages, their servitude becomes perpetual, and they are transferred from one to another, without regard to their feelings or happiness. Thus, is the great mass of the Mexican people

in a state of miserable servitude infinitely more deplorable than that which exists in the United States. No one cares for the wants of the poor Mexican slave. Food, clothing, medicines, are not provided by the master; for, should this be done, it would still enhance the amount of indebtedness, and thus rivet still more securely the manacles of his bondage—placing the goal of liberty still further in the distance. Hence is it that this class of the citizens of Mexico are sunk down into a state of hopeless misery, though of the same blood and race of their masters.

But we rejoice to know that such is not the condition of the negro slaves of the United States. Here the well being of the slave is a matter of deep interest to the master. Like the venerable Patriarchs of olden time, they delight to administer to the wants and happiness of those whom God has committed to their hands. If the slave is sick, a physician administers to his wants; if hungry or naked, he has but to look to his master who provides what is necessary without any care on the part of the slave. No constable or sheriff dogs his steps, for he is out of debt and free from all responsibility, save that of good and honest behavior. The affairs of government disturb not his mind, and if war invade the land, he is not called to the field of carnage.

But the case is far different with the Mexican slave. Contrary to his will he is *pressed* into the service and *forced* to fight the battles of his country, though he own not a foot of soil, nor never can. Surely then, the condition of the slaves of our Southern States, is far superior to that of the people of Mexico.

But terrible as is the condition of that people, in their state of worse than *Russian serfism*, the tender hearted and sympathetic abolitionists are, by their short sighted policy, urging forward the entire black population of the South to an equally miserable con dition. By their policy, the present protective system of slavery would be dissolved, and the whole slave population in the United States emancipated in our midst and thrown upon their own resources for subsistence. What would be the consequence? A state of degradation and misery, similar to that which now exists in Mexico, must inevitably follow. For landholders, to any extent, they can never become, and, without this, how are they to be saved from certain misery? Says our objector, this is easily shown—they can hire out and by their wages sustain themselves and their families, as do other poor men of the land. But this is a conclusion which practical experience does not sustain. The immense number of the slave population (amounting to nearly four million and rapidly increasing) would of necessity prevent it. Were this vast host to be made dependent upon their daily wages for a support, it would fail them. They could not compete with the white laborers that would immediately flood the States which they now inhabit. The consequence would be, that they would be again cast upon the mercy of the whites, who do now, and always will, compose the landholders of the country. In this condition of things, in order to prevent an unbounded increase of pauperism throughout the entire United States, which in time would certainly ensue, "vagrant laws" would

have to be enacted, by which they would be curtailed in their liberty of wandering from place to place, and thus become in all propability as wretched as the miserable serfs of Mexico. A condition, as we have shown, far more distressing than the present system of slavery can ever bring upon them.

There exists but one hope of escape from a fate so dreadful, and *death* is that hope; for it is well known that in all the free states, the blacks have decreased rapidly in numbers. In the state of New York, where they have been free only since 1828, they have decreased in population more than one-half. This is, doubtless, occasioned by their extreme poverty, and imprudence toward their infants, which, for want of care, as respects a covering from the elements, suita ble food and clothing, and medical attendance, die in great numbers. This last is not a matter of surprise to us at all, as it is but a natural characteristic of the race.

The principles of abolitionism are alike subversive of the well-being and happiness of both races. Indeed, not a movement has this political faction ever made, that did not tend to increase the degradation and misery of the negro race. In the state of Kentucky, the removal of slavery has, doubtless, been retarded, by their influence, not less than ten or twenty years. Besides, the actual condition of the slaves has been made worse by the unhallowed excitement and indignation which it has engendered on the part of the masters, who, becoming naturally enraged at being thus unceremoniously molested in their social and domestic affairs, have been forced to deprive their serv-

ants of those liberties which they were wont to extend unto them, lest they should be decoyed away by those unprincipled wretches, who have shown themselves alike the enemies of both master and slave. It has also prevented, in a multitude of instances, masters from learning their slaves to read—a blessing which many a Christian master would gladly have extended to his slaves, had he not been thus prevented.

To the slaves we would say, regard not the abolitionist as your friend, for such he is far from being. The best friend you have on earth is a kind master or mistress, whom you can all secure by faithfully doing your duty. Serve them faithfully, be content with your lot, and give no heed to those who would take you from your homes, and God will reward you for it.

We once supposed that the principle upon which the abolitionists acted in the matter of negro emancipation, was a good and virtuous principle; but long have we had reason to think otherwise. The leaders of this unhallowed faction are bold to assert, that to *better the condition of the black man* is not their object. To free the soil of what they term the odium of slavery, is the end and aim of all their operations; and whether this improve or injure the condition of the black man, is a matter about which they care not. Clear the soil of the stain of slavery, is the cry, no matter how great the cost, or how vast the sacrifice. If a division of the union of the states, or civil war, be the result, let it come, we heed it not. Thus are we forced to believe, that, of all the factions and evil

influences which conspire to undermine and subvert the grand superstructure of American Liberty, that termed Modern Abolitionism is the most dangerous and fearful.

That there are many honest-hearted men in the party, who are actuated by pure sympathy for the slave, in what they have been erroneously taught to believe is the unhappy and oppressed condition in which he is placed, we freely admit. But these people are deceived; they have allowed themselves to be duped and imposed upon by corrupt and unprincipled demagogues, who are prompted by no other than a desire to build up their own fame and fortunes upon the ruins of those of the honorable and unsuspecting of our land. That they are deceived, is proven from the fact that nine-tenths of those who travel through the southern states, and see the slave contented and happy in the enjoyment of that liberty and those blessings which a humane and Christian master delights to provide for those intrusted to his care, return, fully convinced that the servant is the happier of the two, and that to change their relations might be a benefit to the master, but not to the slave. Had the masses of the abolition party the opportunity of making these observations personally, we honestly believe that the universal conclusion of all the good and virtuous would be the same. The average condition of the free blacks of the North, will not bear a comparison with that of the slaves of the South. Were we to advocate the removal of slavery at all, we should be actuated rather out of sympathy for the master than the slave.

That there are evils growing out of the institution of slavery, we do not deny; and that it is liable to abuses, as is every other institution of Divine appointment, we are free to admit. We go further, we admit that it is a moral and political evil of vast magnitude, as is proven by the low state of public morals in the South, and by a comparison of the slave states with the free, in general improvement and prosperity. But, as the history of its every movement, from the period it was first ushered into life in the British House of Lords, to the present time, abundantly testifies, abolitionism is inadequate to the task of its removal; nay, as we have shown, all its operations only tend to rivet more securely the manacles of the slave, and perpetuate the institution of slavery. How unreasonable, how contrary to the dictates of common sense and strict propriety, that its advocates should continue to urge its claims upon the people of the United States.

In view of all this, and of the fact that it is a thing of British origin, of lordly birth, nursed in the cradle of despotism, and fed by the hand of royal aristocracy—as has been every opposing principle and plot against American republicanism—we cannot but regard the *leaders*, at least, of this unhallowed faction—this dissevering principle of strife and contention—as the worst enemies of our country; nay, as *traitors* to the government, whose very existence is hazardous to the well-being and prosperity of the nation. The time is not far distant, we trust, when they will be led to see the error of their ways, and to turn from their folly. When this is done, and this unhallowed

and unnatural war upon southern interests and institutions shall cease, we believe that the natural goodness of heart, the wisdom, philanthropy and Christianity of the people of the slave states, will lead them either to devise a plan for the complete removal of slavery, in harmony with the interests and feelings of both master and slave, or so ameliorate the physical, moral and intellectual condition of the slaves, that their separation from their masters would, like that of Hagar from Abraham, partake more of cruelty and persecution, than of kindness and Christian charity.

Many are bold to affirm, that they would rather dissever the Union than fail in their warfare against slavery. But were this to be accomplished (an event which we pray the Lord may never happen), slavery, if affected at all by it, would but be perpetuated. The condition of the slave, if changed at all thereby, would be for the worse. The North would open her arms with still greater boldness to those who could make their escape from their masters, and the result would be, a curtailing of the usual liberties of the slave and the adoption of a system of servitude far more rigid and severe. This the operations of that party have already effected to a very considerable extent, and as they increase in numbers and in the boldness of their attacks, will continue to effect, to an extent that will cause the slave to curse the day that gave birth to abolitionism.

Having now, as we believe, given a true history of the origin of the negro race—of his character, morally and physically—the nature of Noah's curse—its

indorsement by Moses in the law—the fortunes of the race in past ages, as well as in the present times—we desist from further remarks, having done what we can toward allaying the conflict now raging between the slavery and anti-slavery classes of the great public; believing that good men, whose consciences have been formed by reading the Scriptures on this subject, will honor the source of their education, by soothing, all in their power, the unhappy ferment, and thus, if possible, prevent the separation of the states, and a horrible civil war in America, which, were it to happen, would be the joy of all the monarchies of Europe, and their friends in the United States.

But, in closing this work, we ought not, perhaps, to hide it, that the feelings, the sympathies, the education and preconceived principles of the writer, have once been all at war with the facts brought from the Bible on the subject of negro slavery. But *now* we feel the amazing importance of bowing these prejudices to the word of God, submitting, with all lowliness of mind, this mysterious matter to a higher adjudication than is to be found among men, in which frame of spirit we must remain, till a stronger light than hitherto has shone on the mind of the author, shall irradiate his understanding in relation to the principles advanced in this book, respecting the fortunes of the race of Ham.

We desire it to be understood, that in all we have said in this work, we have had an eye to *truth*, so far as we could ascertain it, and that we have not written a word from prejudice against the people of

the blacks; having exhibited them as we have found them, for which we feel no manner of accountability, as the difference, in *all respects*, between the negro and the white race, as to the physical and mental being, is of God, the Creator.

Here ends our labor, whether good or bad,
Of which our pen assures that she is glad;
And if light is shed on the misty space
Of ancient times, and the dark negro race,
Then we rejoice; but if not, then we mourn,
And know not where for truth our face should turn.
But, as a vessel sent the winds to brave,
We launch this book upon the public wave,
Where rocks and shoals may cross its dubious way,
And dash its sides and sails amid the spray.
And yet this may not be its final fate,
Though many who may read, may also *hate*—
Yet *some*, perhaps, may *love*, of thinking men,
And justify the author and his pen.
Should this be *so*, which hope our thoughts inspire,
A better goal than *this* we can't desire.

STRICTURES ON ABOLITIONISM.

NATIONAL COLONIZATION OF THE FREE BLACK POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, ADVOCATED.

BY THE PUBLISHER.

THE present has very significantly been styled, "The Golden Age" of the world. Compared with all the ages which compose the measure of the past, there is none to equal it. It is a towering eminence, from whose summit the eye may survey the broad expanse of the world's history; age preceding age, as wave follows wave, with here and there a bright spot, like the green oasis in the wide extended desert.

No frowning despot now sits upon the throne of universal empire, to mark out the channels of human thought, or set bounds to the development of civilization, of science, and of art. Free as the proud bird of liberty, when released from the bloody fangs of the British lion, and permitted to soar aloft, and bathe his golden plumage in the burning radiance of the

mid-day sun, the empire of mind, the spirit of investigation and research, and the genius of invention and improvement, are enabled to grapple successfully with the powers of ignorance, vice, and superstition, which have ever bound man to earth, and ground him in the dust, and to develop countless ways and means for his elevation and improvement.

Our country, too; what a prodigy among the nations of the earth! What a monument to the giant powers of the human mind and Christian enterprise, when uncontrolled by regal authority or papal influence. Like first creation, a new world has been ushered from the dark chaos of heathenism, into the bright sunshine of Christian civilization, as it were, in the short period of a day. The magic wand of science and Christianity is waived over the great wilderness, and it is suddenly transformed into a fruitful field or a populous city. The dark and boundless forest, which but yesterday re-echoed the deafening roar of the wild beast, or the piercing yell of the warrior savage, has disappeared, and cultivated fields, thriving villages, and populous cities, resounding with the busy hum of industry, the classic melody of literature, and the richer notes of Christian worship, supply its place. Those vast inland seas and deep rolling rivers, which were wont to sport upon their heaving bosoms the frail canoe of the wild Indian, now teem with the commerce of a mighty nation. Where ran the narrow trail of the wild buffalo, and the wilder savage, now extends the great iron-bound thoroughfares, where

speeds the noisy locomotive, the triumphal car of modern improvement, the iron horse with his bowels of fire, carrying in his wake, with the velocity of the winged messengers, a multitude sufficient to constitute the world's convention, or a congress of nations. By its side, too, may be seen the solitary line of the magnetic telegraph, upon which the lightnings of heaven yield allegiance to the mighty prowess of cultivated reason, and become the willing servants of man—the common carriers of human thought.

But not alone in this wonderful triumph of civilized over savage life, of Christianity over barbarism, of the arts over the undisturbed repose of uncultivated nature, are the superiority, the true greatness, the matchless prowess of our nation exhibited. It is in a moral point of view that our national superiority stands forth prominent—in the great work of civilizing and Christianizing mankind—of giving to the world a form of civil government nearer perfect than any that had preceded it—of exhibiting a practical solution of the great question: Is man capable of self-government? In all these great works of moral reformation and scientific research—these majestic schemes and systems for enlightening and ennobling the human mind, and elevating the standard of human happiness, which characterize the golden age in which we live—it is a cheering thought, a proud reflection, that they are generally the offspring of American genius and enterprise, and sustained by American benevolence and philanthropy.

The watch-word of this generation is—Onward! Every political revolution, and every domestic enterprise, has an upward and redeeming tendency. This is true, not only in a civil and secular, but in a moral point of view. The darkness of heathenism and savage life, is rapidly receding before the glorious sunlight of civilization and Christianity. The glorious sun of republican liberty, which, upon the natal day of American Independence, first dawned upon the world, is beginning to extend its life-giving, regenerating influences over the moral political wastes of despotic Europe. Kings are beginning to tremble for the safety of their respective thrones, and their subjects to look forward to the no very distant period, when despotism, with its haggard train of moral, social, and political evils, shall give place to republican liberty; and constitutions, modelled after the "*Magna Charta*" of American Independence, shall become the organic law of the several states, kingdoms, and empires of the old world. The numerous plans which have been devised, and are being carried into operation, for the purpose of extending and sustaining the various systems of civilizing and Christianizing the nations of the earth, speak much for the wisdom and philanthropy of their authors, and are truly worthy the countenance and support of every friend of humanity.

But in the present, as in all past ages, we find the human mind more or less prone to run to extremes. Like the resistless torrent of the mountain stream, which being accelerated by its own momentum, bursts

over its natural barriers, and counteracts many of its naturally good effects by its destruction of surrounding objects. Thus is it with the philanthropy of many of the present age. They have a zeal without knowledge. Prompted by the impulse of feeling, without the exercise of reason, they often resort to means which are altogether incompatible with the ends which they desire to accomplish. We find, therefore, among the many systems of reformation which have been devised in this our day and generation, many to admire and sanction; others, again, which we cannot consistently give assent to, because we conceive them not to be in harmony with reason, truth, and justice.

And first among these, is that species of philanthropy or fanaticism which would take from a man that which, of right, belongs to him, and appropriate it to other purposes, without remunerating him therefor, gaining his consent, or even consulting his wishes. It is to be presumed, that there are but few of the enlightened citizens of our common country, who, if they fully comprehended its ultimate tendency, would subscribe to a species of fanaticism of this nature. Yet do we find a considerable party in the United States, one that is not wanting either in respect of numbers or of talent, that is organized upon this very principle. In all probability, the ground upon which it is based, and the principles involved in its organization, are not fully comprehended by many, perhaps the larger number of those who have identified themselves with this party; but we have reason to believe that this is

not the case with the leaders, the prime movers, the pampered stipendiaries who direct its movements, and give tone and currency to the practical operations of its hidden machinery. Many there may be, who have never reflected upon the matter, who have never taken the second sober thought concerning it, but have been prompted by an impulse engendered by excitement. But that this is the case with all, we are slow to believe. For the ignorant and deluded, there may be some shadow of excuse or palliation; but upon the wilful perpetrators of error and delusion—the originators of this suicidal policy—the leaders of this heterogeneous horde of ranting factionists and unprincipled enthusiasts, we forbear to pass judgment. Disturbers of the public peace, and engenderers of private feuds, the baseness of their designs is equalled only by the unreasonableness and inconsistency of their tenets, or principles of action.

Such is *modern abolitionism* and its advocates, a withering blighting curse, a pestiferous excresence upon the body politic, a hideous deformity, begotten by the father of lies, born of the mother of harlots, and nursed by the bloody hand of vile misanthropy; its breath is pestilence and death, its practical operations the destruction of all domestic tranquillity and social order, of all peace, friendship, and good will amongst men.

The inquiry, whence originated such a species of pseudo philanthropy or wild fanaticism, may not be devoid of interest, as something of its nature may be

inferred from its parentage. By investigation, we find it to be of *foreign origin*, an *imported* article. It was conceived and brought forth in the British House of Lords. But why transplanted? Simply for the reason, that it was the interest of the manufacturers to find a market *abroad* for it.

America, and her republican institutions; her ever onward and upward march to greatness and glory; have ever been objects of jealousy and hatred to tyrants and their fawning votaries. Various and powerful were their schemes which they, in their matchless subtlety and sacrilegious impiety, devised and set on foot for the subversion of the grand superstructure of American Liberty. But when foiled and defeated on every hand, when despair was about to possess every soul, the great enemy of human happiness presents a new device, for the consideration of British lords, his willing subjects. A system of *nominal slavery* is discovered to exist in the United States. Horrible inconsistency! Disgraceful outrage! What! Slavery exist under a republican government! It must not be. The sympathies of the most corrupt and oppressive legislative body that ever disgraced the foot-stool of Deity, are aroused for the *first* time in their history. Tears of mock sympathy are seen coursing the bloated features of pampered tyrants, and proud aristocrats. The excitement increases, descends to the masses. Venerable matrons catch the theme, look abroad over millions of their oppressed fellow subjects, who never enjoyed the luxury of a

comfortable meal in all their lives, and discover that to longer pollute their morning beverage with a product of slave labor, is criminal.

And thus argues Parliament:—It is true, slavery exists in our own West Indies. But as these slaves are mostly the property of this honorable (?) body, we will appropriate an amount (£21,000,000 or $105,000,000) from the national treasury, sufficient to indemnify us against *loss*, adopt a seven years' apprenticeship system of emancipation, and then shall we be prepared to wage endless war against American slavery and American institutions. The unhallowed proposition receives the unqualified approbation of these time-serving votaries of tyranny and corruption. West India slavery is abolished upon the plan proposed.*

---

* For the success of this experiment, see the following extracts, to which volumes of a similar character might be added:—

"A recent letter from Jamaica states that the poverty and industrial prostration of that island are almost incredible. It says that since 1832, out of six hundred and fifty sugar estates then in cultivation, more than one hundred and fifty have been abandoned and the works broken up. This has thrown out of cultivation over 200,000 acres of rich land, which, in 1832, gave employment to about 30,000 laborers, and yielded over 15,000 hogshead of sugar, and 6,000 puncheons of rum.

"During the same period, over five hundred coffee plantations have been abandoned and their works broken up. This threw out of cultivation over 200,000 acres more of land, which, in 1832, required the labor of over 30,000 men."

"HAYTI—MARRIAGE RELATIONS.—The Moniteur Haytien gives an official statement of the births and deaths, marriages and divorces, during the first quarter of the present year, in the West, North, and South Provinces—seventy towns in all. In these towns the whole number of children born in three months was 1863, of whom, 1700 were born out of wedlock, and only 163 were legitimate! Such a monstrous disproportion

And now commences the crusade against the institution as it exists in the United States of America. A motley corps of harping demagogues, tourists, intriguers, seducers, pamphleteers, and electioneerers, are commissioned to canvass the free States of the North, for the purpose of arraying the North against the South in hostile mood, by arousing the prejudices and firing the passions of their peaceful inhabitants, by agitating the question of the unqualified abolition of slavery.

But why all this upon the part of the erudite, and accomplished statesmen of the parent land? Are there no objects of charity upon which to pour out their overflowing benevolence and philanthropy at home? Let the countless millions of woe-begotten groaning, British subjects throughout England, Ireland,*

---

between these two classes of children exists in no other country, we venture to say, on the face of the earth, where the marriage institution is recognized. In the same towns the deaths in that period were 406; 65 marriages, and 1 divorce. In Port au Prince alone, the capital of the Empire, there were 413 children born, and only 29 of them in marriage, 77 deaths and 20 marriages."

* "COLEMAN, in his work entitled 'Life and Manners in England and France,' gives the following most lamentable description of the poor in Ireland:—'I never saw a more beautiful country,' says he, 'though art has done little for it. The wretchedness of the great mass of the people is utterly beyond all description. I have been into cabins dug out of the bog, with no warmth but the heat of the mud in which they have been excavated, with the roof covered with turf and straw, and the water standing in puddles on the outside, without chimney, window, door, floor, bed, chair, table, knife, or fork; the whole furniture consisting of some straw to lie down upon, a pot to boil the potatoes, a tin cup to drink out of, and a wicker basket to take up the potatoes in after they

and, indeed, the whole wide-extended dominion of the Sea-born Empire, upon whose limitless bounds the sun never sets, give the answer. Was it a pure spirit of charity and benevolence, that prompted the enterprise? Nay, verily. A far different motive lay concealed beneath the gilded folds of royal duplicity. Standing upon an eminence of a seat in the British Parliament, the political seer could easily penetrate the dark vista of the future, and predict the result of the unhallowed agitation of this vexed question.

But why commence the work in States where the institution does not exist? Why not go into the slave States, and meet the question *fairly*, by dis-

---

are boiled, which is set down in the middle of the floor, and parents and children squat down like Hottentots on the ground and eat their food with their fingers, sometimes with salt and often without; this is literally the whole of their living, day after day, and year after year, excepting that on Christmas day they contrive to get a little piece of meat and a bit of bread.' The writer has seen thousands, yea, a million, living so. 'I could hardly credit my own senses,' continues he, 'until I went into the cabins, and felt my way in the smoke and darkness, and actually put my hand on the turf sides.' Here they all lie down, parents and children, brothers and sisters, on the straw at night, huddled together, literally naked, with the pigs, oftentimes the ass or horse, and sometimes the cow in the same room. 'Such is the manner of living of large masses of the people of Ireland. 'And this in a country belonging to the richest and most refined people on the globe, not forty-eight hours journey from London; not one-fourth part of which is cultivated, and containing millions of untilled acres of as rich land as the sun ever shone upon.' The heart sickens at such details of human misery. The condition of these people is worse, by far, than that of the negro slaves of the slave-holding States of this country, whose condition excites so much sympathy among the self-styled philanthropists of Great Britain."

cussing it with those who alone were empowered to legislate with respect to the institution of slavery? The reason is obvious. This warfare did not originate in any inate opposition to the principle of servitude or bondage, or from any inherent love of universal liberty, which existed or was cherished in the hearts of its originators. Had this been the case, an ample field for the exercise of their benevolent desires and philanthropic emotions existed in their own immediate midst. A far different motive influenced the action of these cunning deceivers and unprincipled demagogues. They foresaw that direful consequences to republicanism, and to the whole American people, hung suspended upon the proposed agitation of this question, the prosecution of this warfare upon the part of the *Northern free States*. It was evident that every aggressive movement made by these factionists in the north, would produce a correspondent, or counteracting movement on the part of the friends of the south. Thus do we discover the true origin of this unhallowed faction, this unrighteous combination of foreign and domestic talent and influence, against the welfare of our common country. It originated with the enemies of universal freedom and republican liberty, the fawning sycophants of tyranny, the willing tools of oppression. The principles of modern abolitionism were first promulged in the northern free States by British demagogues and emissaries, supported by British gold, as have been their successors to the present day. All, from the

district school pedagogue of the Garrisonian school, to the Honorable Senator advocating with burning eloquence in the Halls of Crongress, the beauties (?) of the Wilmot Proviso, have received and acknowledged the irresistible influence of the same corrupting *golden* agency. Says the able correspondent of the National Intelligencer:—

"On your side of the Atlantic, you cannot be ignorant how well they understand the power and application of *money*, as well as slander, in their two-fold crusade. We, who learn their secret, and scan their public operations, in Great Britain and France, positively *know* that they gather and use *extraordinary sums*, and they have always at command ample subsidees for every kind of service. We are not surprised, that while they deal chiefly with stipendiaries, they should arraign, as corrupt, all independent judgment and action against their own designs and machinations. American character in general has seriously suffered, by the unremitted, wide-spread, unscrupulous war in Europe, which, for many years past, has been carried on against American slavery and slaveholders. In every quarter, the enemies of our Union, and Republicanism, calculate most on the slavery question as a disturber, and dissolvent, and as an expedient of deformation and discredit. If the European nations, or people—British, French, or other—should at any time be disposed to second, or urge their governments in belligerent endeavors to cripple American power and institutions, it will be from the diffusive prejudices and antipathies, from the aversion or odium, created by the machinery of the anti-slavery societies and their abettors.

Last winter, pamphlets written and printed in New England, were placed in Galignani's Reading Rooms, to attract English readers, which filled me with horror, by the enormity of the charges and invectives, and the intensity of the venom lavished on the American slaveholders universally, and indeed on the whole American people, except abolition zealots. I have closely followed and studied, in America and Europe, the proceedings, dispositions, and purposes of this sect, which has invented and spread more noxious falsehood and atrocious calumny than any other of modern times, and whose schemes involve more malignity and evil than could be imputed to Jesuits, Illuminati, Carbonari, or the other orders and associations denounced as conspirators against human welfare."

A *dissolution* of the Union was, undoubtedly, the ultimate and real design of those foreign founders and abettors of abolitionism. This gained, and the pride of the British lion would be avenged for the disgraceful defeats and losses sustained during the revolutionary and late wars. Not unwisely, then, did they count upon "the slavery question as a disturber and dissolvent," as an effectual expedient to cripple American power and institutions. They acted the part of sagacious and accomplished statesmen, in selecting this as the Archimedian lever, with which to subvert the grand superstructure of American Independence. They have effectually sowed the seeds of discord and disaffection in our midst, of which "disunion" is the legitimate and inevitable offspring,

unless checked by the conservative principles of truth, reason, and justice. Our Union dissolved, and all that the most inveterate enemies of republican liberty, of civil and religious freedom, could desire, is accomplished. How near we have approximated to this result, the present convulsed and perturbated state of the country, and the late disgraceful scenes enacted in the halls of our national legislature, too clearly indicate. That we stand upon the verge of a fearful revolution, is evident, unless saved by the timely interference of the genial spirit of concession and compromise.

Modern abolitionism, then, we discover, is not a thing which exists in name only, a shadow without a substance, a mere child of fancy; but a stern reality, and deep-layed conspiracy, a well-organized system, upheld by a powerful combination of the most powerful and dangerous enemies of our common country, who are actuated by a desire, not to ameliorate the condition of the benighted African, but to strike a death-blow at the genius of republican liberty, to sap the very foundations of our civil polity, to poison the gushing fountains of our domestic tranquillity, social intercourse, and national security. That our country, the cause of human freedom and national civilization, the cause of all mankind, have more to fear from this organization, than from all other opposing elements combined, we entertain not a doubt. To prove that we speak not unadvisedly, and that our fears and deductions are not unfounded, we beg

leave to introduce the following, from authorities, the intelligence of whom, we presume, will not for a moment be questioned:—

[*From the Nashville Union.*]

"THE UNION, PAST AND FUTURE.—We have received a pamphlet entitled, 'The Union, Past and Future—How it Works, and how to Save it. By a Citizen of Virginia.' It is, as the Richmond Enquirer remarks, in noticing it, a most luminous exposition of the extraordinary advantages which the North has derived over the South from the Union; the wonderful resources which capacitate the South for entire independence of the North; the reliance of the latter upon the former for its prosperity—its inevitable poverty in peace, and weakness in war, in the event of a dissolution—and the overwhelming considerations of interest and policy, which should thus induce the North to cease the prosecution of those suicidal measures which endanger her longer enjoyment of the incalculable blessings of wealth and power, protection and honor, flowing to her, under the Union, from the very institutions which she would destroy. No threats are made—no menaces indulged. A candid statement is given of the facts in the case, and of the relations which the two great geographical divisions of the country sustain to each other in a politico-economical point of view. The munificent generosity of the South—the heavy and unequal burdens she has borne, and still bears, in the support of the Federal Government—the splendid abundance of her varied resources, still multiplying, still enlarging—the safety and

facility with which she could maintain her own Union, with a less expenditure of revenue, than she now annually contributes quite gratuitously for the benefits of the North—her manly determination to require "Equality of Independence"—these facts are calmly, but plainly and distinctly stated; not, indeed, to encourage the idea of dissolution, but to remind us that we are under no grinding necessity, no compulsion of poverty, for ever to endure Northern vassalage, usurpation, and insults, and to open the eyes of the North, too long blinded by power, to her true interests and imminent danger.

"It would be well for the Union, if this pamphlet were circulated throughout its whole extent, and read by all its millions. It would bring home to the South a knowledge of her real strength. It would bring home to the North a knowledge of her real weakness. It would show the one that she could sustain herself alone, in peace and war, with safety and honor. It would show the other that alone, in peace or war, she must ignobly fall with "all her greatness." It would inspire the South with a manly independence, which would disdain further compromises of her interests and dignity, where concession has but led to aggression, and magnanimity to imposition. It would inspire the North with a just sense of her dependence, and an enlightened apprehension of losing, by the further provocation of a generous, but outraged and indignant people, the grand sources of her prosperity, happiness, and honor. Each section would better understand the attitude of the other, and such understanding might lead to the permanent establishment of a more equal and harmonious Union.

"Below we present a series of extracts from this excellent pamphlet, interspersed with an occasional remark of our own

"After a brief introduction, the author sets out with a proposition which he fully establishes by facts and figures: 'The history of the causes of the present crisis, is the history of ever-growing demands on the part of the North, and of concession on the part of the South.' We cannot follow him step by step, but must content ourselves with marking only a few of the principal *metæ* on the courses. He begins with the cession, by Virginia, to the Union, of the magnificent domain north-west of the Ohio—the most splendid dower that ever bride gave away to please her grasping lord:—

"'It was a country well suited for slavery, for even so late as 1806, we find a convention of the inhabitants of Indiana petitioning for its temporary introduction, and a committee of the House of Representatives reporting through their chairman, Mr. Garnett, of Virginia, in favor of their prayer. But while Virginia was guilty of this suicidal generosity, she annexed one condition for her own advantage, that no more than five States should be formed out of this territory, so as to preserve a due balance of political power in the Union. Yet even this condition the North has violated, and 22,336 square miles of its area, more than the average size of all the free States east of the Ohio, have gone to constitute the future State of Minnesota.

"'This was the first step, and the next was at the formation of the present Constitution, when a contest arose as to the ratio of representation. Should the South have as many representatives, in proportion to her population, as the North? It was just and right that she should. The Federal Government had no concern with the relations between blacks and whites, the classes

of her population. It had no right to inquire whether the negro was a slave or free. The slaves were a better population than the free negroes, and if the latter were to be counted at their full number in the appointment of representation, so ought the former. The right could not be refused, because the slaves were naturally or legally equal to the whites, for so are the free negroes. It could not be refused, because they have no political rights, for neither have the free negroes, paupers, women, or children. They are an essential part of the population; if absent, their places must be filled by other laborers, and if they are property as well as population, it is an additional reason for giving their owners the security of full representation for them. But the South, as usual, yielded to Northern exorbitance, and agreed that five slaves should count only as three free negroes. Therefore, instead of 103 representatives in Congress, we have only 91.

"'But the free States are not content with this, and now propose to take away twenty-one more of our representatives. They say that the right of representation for three-fifths of our slave population, is a sufficient reason for refusing admission into the Union to any new slave States and Massachusetts has proposed, by a solemn legislative resolution, to amend the Constitution so as to deprive us of this guaranteed representation. Public meetings and eminent men have approved of her proposal.

"'In return for this surrender of her rights, the South inserted in the Constitution two stipulations in her own favor. The first provided, that direct taxes should be apportioned amongst the States in the ratio of their representation. According to this provision, we ought now to pay a little more than one-third of the taxes; we actually pay, under the present system, over three-fourths. The amount levied from customs, since the formation of the Government, has been about one thousand and forty-seven millions of dollars; and had these duties been paid in the ratio which the Constitution indicates as just and

proper, the South would have paid four hundred and forty-two, and the North six hundred and five millions of dollars. But, as we shall see hereafter, the slave States have really paid seven hundred and ninety-eight millions of dollars, and the free States only two hundred and forty-nine millions of dollars. Therefore, the South has gained nothing by this stipulation in return for her loss of reputation.

"'The other stipulation in favor of the South, was, that 'no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of party to whom such service or labor may be due.' This provision rests for its due fulfilment, not merely upon the Federal Government, but, like a treaty stipulation between distant nations, must be carried into effect by the municipal regulations of the parties, and their comity and good feeling. Yet what has it been worth to the South? So far from executing this clause, and 'delivering up' the runaway slaves, the free States refuse to pass any efficient law to that end in Congress; and such is their state of feeling, and such their domestic laws, that any federal law, even if enacted, could not be executed. In their own governments, they make it a criminal offence, punishable by fine and imprisonment, for any officer, and in some States for any *citizens*, to assist in seizing or 'delivering up' a fugitive slave. Their whites and their free negroes assemble in mobs to rescue the slave from the master who is bold enough to capture him, and then accusing himself of the riot they made themselves, throw him in a felon's jail, and load him with fetters, as Pennsylvania has recently done by a respectable citizen of Maryland. When Troutman, of Kentucky, pursued his slaves into the town of Marshall, in Michigan, he was surrounded by a mob, led by the most influential citizens, who declared that '*though the law was in his favor*, yet the public sentiment must and should supercede it,' and a resolution was tumultuously

adopted, that 'these Kentuckians shall not remove from this place these slaves by moral, physical, or *legal* force.' A *Magistrate* fined Troutman, one hundred dollars for the *trespass* in attempting to arrest his slave; and he was recognized to appear at the next Circuit Court, for drawing a pistol on a *negro* who was forcing the door of his room! But this was a mild treatment compared with the fate of the lamented Kennedy, of Hagerstown. When he followed his slave into Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and was peaceably, with his own consent, bringing him away, an infuriated mob of whites and free blacks, incited by the Professor of a College, assaulted and brutally murdered him! It is estimated by Mr. Clingman, that the whole loss to the South, in fugitive slaves, is not less than fifteen millions of dollars. Mr. Butler, of the Senate, estimated the annual loss to the South at two hundred thousand dollars, and more recent statements make it probable that he was under the true amount. The philanthropy of the North does not extend to voluntary free negro emigrants from the South, but is confined to the runaway slaves, whom it can force by fear to work for immoderately low wages.'

"Briefly tracing the growth of the anti-slavery faction in the North, the author next proceeds to speak of the admission of Missouri. He says:—

"'A clause prohibiting slavery was inserted into the bill for the admission of Missouri, when it became apparent that her people would reject such a bill, if passed, and with a government regularly organized, according to all the constitutional precedents, would remain without the Union as a separate, independent State, unless the federal authority undertook to subdue her, and convulsed the country by a civil war. In this state of the question, the South had only to remain firm, and the North would be forced to yield; but, as usual, the South was weak enough to retreat from her ground, and, in her love for the Union, she submitted

to a provision for ever prohibiting slavery in all that part of the Territory of Louisiana (except Missouri itself) which lies north of 36° 30', the *southern boundary* of Virginia and Kentucky. The South thus lost, without any equivalent, nine-tenths of what was already a slave territory, purchased by the common treasure. She retained only one hundred and ten thousand square miles for the emigration of her own citizens, and surrendered nine hundred and sixty-five thousand to the North.

"'Yet even this so-called compromise, forced upon us by Northern voters, is now spurned by the free States. They have derived all the possible benefit from it on this side of the Rocky Mountains, and they refuse us the poor advantage which it would secure, of two hundred and four thousand, three hundred and eighty-three square miles, out of eight hundred and sixty-seven thousand, five hundred and forty-one on the other side!'

"Here follows the climax. The extract is long, but we are sure it will repay perusal:—

"'It is now proposed to exclude the South from the Territory of California and New Mexico, four hundred and forty-six thousand, nine hundred and thirty-eight square miles, large enough to make more than eleven States equal to Ohio. The South paid her share, and, as we shall see, far more than her full share, of the expenses of the Mexican war. Of the gallant volunteers who fought its battles, she furnished forty-five thousand six hundred and forty, and the North twenty-three thousand and eighty-four—but little more than half as many. She sent one man out of every twenty-six of military age—the North only sent one out of every one hundred and twenty-four. How those battles were fought and won, of which section the Generals were natives, whose regiments faltered, and whose left two of their men stretched upon the bloody field, while the third planted the stars and stripes upon the Mexican battlements,

the South will leave to history to say. And now it is proposed to exclude the survivors and their fellow-citizens from the equal enjoyments of the conquest of the war! And why?—because, as the Vermont resolutions declare, '*Slavery is a crime against humanity!*'

"'The North next propose to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and so make a harbor for runaways, and a centre of abolition agitation in the very heart of Virginia and Maryland. This is to be done in defiance, alike of good faith and of constitutional obligation; and why? because, as the Gott resolution, passed by the House of Representatives, declares, '*Slavery is infamous!*'

"'The Northern vote in Congress on these questions is almost unanimous, without distinction of parties, against the South. The exceptions are daily fewer, swept away by the overpowering side of fanatical public sentiment at the North. The State legislatures are equally agreed. They have all, and the majority more than once, adopted resolutions of the most offensive character. The next treat is to abolish slavery in the dockyards, forts, and arsenals, for there Congress has the same jurisdiction and responsibility as in the District. It is asserted that slavery cannot exist, without a special law to establish it, in the new Territories, because property in negroes is, as they pretend, a creation of municipal regulation alone, and, therefore, ceases beyond the limits of the State which authorizes it. Not only does this argument fail in its major proposition, for there is no law establishing slavery in any state where it exists; but it fails also in its application, for the limits and authority of each slave State now extend to the new Territory held by the common Federal agent. But, if true, by parity of reasoning, slavery cannot exist on the high seas, and so say our abolitionists. Therefore, the slaves who leave Richmond on a voyage to New Orleans, are free as soon as the vessel leaves the shore. The prohibition of what they call the slave trade on the high seas, and then on the Mississippi, whose waters they pretend are common

property, and then between the states, will quickly follow each other. What would be left the South in such a condition? With asylums for runaways and stations for abolition agents in every state; the mail converted into a colporteur of incendiary tracts; forbid to carry our slaves from state to state; unable to migrate to new or more fertile lands, and thus renovate our fortunes and give our sons a new theatre for their energies, without sacrificing all our habits, associations, and property, and yet, with all this, bound to pay taxes and fight battles for conquests, we are to have no share in and for a government known to us only by its tyranny, how miserable would be our thraldom! Can any Southern man bear the idea of such degradation? He might endure the loss of his rich conquests in California, but can he bear to be excluded because his institutions are infamous? because he is branded with inferiority, and under the ban of the civilized world? If he can, then is he worthy of all, and more than all, that is threatened him.

"'But abolition will not stop, even when slavery is thus hemmed in, 'localized and discouraged,' as senator Chase proposes. Anti-slavery sentiment is to be made the indispensable condition of appointment to Federal Office; and thus, by bringing Southern men to treachery, the war is to be carried on to the last fell deed of all—the abolition of slavery within the States—for, to quote Randolph once more, 'Fanaticism, political or religious, has no stopping place, short of Heaven, or—of Hell!'

"'The slave states have but thirty votes in the Senate, and two of these (Delaware) can hardly be counted upon in their defence. Nor is it possible to increase her strength by new slave states. Rufus King long since avowed that the object of the North was political power, and she will never permit Florida or Texas to be divided. A serious claim is already set up to all Texas west of the Nueces, as new territory, acquired by treaty from Mexico, to which the Wilmot proviso may and should be applied. The only territory south of the Missouri compromise line, and east of the Rocky Mountains, is

the district of fifty-eight thousand, three hundred and forty-six square miles, ceded for ever to the Indians; on the other hand the North has west of the Mississippi and east of the Rocky Mountains, exclusive of the Indian territory,

723,248 square miles.

Add the part of the old Northwest Territory, added to Minnesota in violation of the Virginia deed of cession - - - - -	22,336	"	"
All of Oregon - - - -	341,463	"	"
In all of undisputed territory	1,087,047	"	"

or enough to make twenty-eight such States as Ohio, or twenty-one larger than Iowa. This addition alone to the strength of the North would give her nearly the three-fourths required to amend the Constitution and abolish slavery at her pleasure, if we can suppose that she would take the trouble to enact an amendment to do that which Mr. Adams declared could be done, in certain cases, under half a dozen clauses in the Constitution as it now stands. But when we consider that, *in case of our submission to the Wilmot proviso*, the North will have all California,

448,691 square miles.

New Mexico east of the Rio Grande	124,933	"	"
Texas, between the Nueces and the Rio Grande - - - - -	52,018	"	"
In all - - - - - -	625,642	"	"

more than all the present free States, equal to twenty-one States of their average size, or sixteen such states as Ohio, or twelve larger than Iowa, in addition to all we before computed, her preponderance becomes truly enormous. Fifteen slaves States to seventy-four free States—not to mention the chances for several more in Canada! Can any one suppose that such a union could subsist as a union of equals?

"'In this alarming situation, the South has no hope but in her own firmness. She wished to preserve the Union as it was, and she must, therefore, insist upon sufficient guaranties for the observance of her rights and her future political equality, or she must dissolve a Union which no longer possesses its original character. When this alternative is placed before the North, she will determine, according to the value she places upon the federal league, and we may anticipate her choice if we can count what it has been worth to her, and how large a moral and material treasure she must surrender, if she persists in pushing her aggressions to its overthrow.'"

[*Speech of T. L. Clingman, of North Carolina.*]

"Sir, the force and extent of the present anti-slavery movement of the North is not understood by the South. Until within the last few months, I had supposed that even if California and New Mexico should come in as free States, that agitation would subside so as to produce no further action. A few months' travel in the interior of the North has changed my opinion. Such is now the condition of public sentiment there, that the making of the Mexican territory all free, in any mode, would be regarded as an anti-slavery triumph, and would accelerate the general movement against us. It is not difficult to perceive how that state of public sentiment has been produced there. The old abolition societies have done a good deal to poison the popular mind. By circulating an immense number of inflammatory pamphlets, filled with all manner of falsehood and calumny against the South, its institutions, and its men, because there was no contradiction in that quarter, they had created a high degree of prejudice against us. As soon as it became

probable that there would be an acquisition of territory, the question at once became a great practical one, and the politicians immediately took the matter in hand. With a view at once of strengthening the position, they seized upon this matter which the abolition societies (whose aid both parties courted in the struggle) had furnished from time to time, and diffused and strengthened it as much as possible, and thereby created an immense amount of hostility to Southern institutions. Everything there contributes to this movement; candidates are brought out by the caucus system, and if they fail to take that sectional ground which is deemed strongest there, they are at once discarded. The mode of nominating candidates, as well as of conducting the canvass, is destructive of anything like independence in the representative. They do not, as gentlemen often do in the South and West, take ground against the popular clamor, and sustain themselves by direct appeals to the intelligence and reason of their constituents. Almost the whole of the Northern press co-operated in the movement, with the exception of the New York Herald, (which, with its large circulation, published matter on both sides,) and a few other liberal papers, everything favorable to the South has been carefully excluded from the Northern papers. By these combined efforts, a degree of feeling and prejudice has been gotten up against the South, which is most intense in all the interior.

"I was surprised last winter to hear a Northern Senator say, that in the town in which he lived it would excite great astonishment if it were known that a Northern lady would, at the time of the meeting of the two Houses, walk up to the Capitol with a Southern

Senator; that they had always been taught to consider Southerners generally as being so coarse and ruffianly in manner that a lady would not trust herself in such a presence. This anecdote, sir, does not present too strong a picture of the condition of sentiment in portions of the interior of the Northern country. How far gentlemen on this floor are to be influenced in their action by such a state of opinion, I leave them to decide."

Let no one, therefore, be consoled with the idea, that this self-styled "American Anti-Slavery Society," is wanting either in numbers or influence. It is a powerful combination of American and foreign talent and capital, composed of all sects and parties, of all castes, grades, and conditions of society, from the British lord to the factory operative, from the self-important Free-soiler, to the ranting factionist of the Garrisonian school; all alike infatuated with a principle of fanaticism which knows no bound; capable of wielding an influence, which has already shaken our government from its centre to its circumference, and which will be felt for ages to come.

The principles involved in the organization of this faction are erroneous, and inconsistent with the well-being of both master and slave. They were conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity. They are in direct violation of the laws of God and man, of reason and revelation, being an unqualified warfare upon an institution wisely ordained by Divine benefi-

cence, and sanctioned by the whole volume of human experience. It is alleged, that the slaveholder is, of necessity, an unprincipled tyrant; nay, worse, an irreligious libertine, who regards neither the laws of God, nor man, nor respects the established usages and customs of civilized society. Although he is but exercising a right which is guarantied by the constitution of our common country, and acting in conformity with a principle which was recognized as of old by our forefathers, the framers of the organic law of the land, those pure patriots of the revolution, who acknowledged no other standard of justice than that contained in the sacred writings; yet is he denounced by these miserable factionists, as the most corrupt, licentious, and profligate of all the sons of men. Regardless of the teachings of the inspired volume and human experience, corroborated by the evidence of their own senses, they have assumed that all men of every race, nation, tribe, and kindred under heaven, are morally, intellectually, and physically, equal; and upon this wild and fallacious hypothesis, they have based their false theory, and maintained it with a zeal worthy of a good cause. The basis upon which their policy rests, is the assumption that slavery is *sinful* and *unprofitable*.

Having failed in their endeavors to convince the slaveholder that the former is true, and that he is bound by obligations the most sacred and uncompromising, to adopt immediate and unconditional

emancipation, they have assumed the latter horn of the dilemma, and now contend that slavery is *unprofitable*, that it tends to impoverish the State, and weaken the resources of the Government. The means upon which they now rely to arrest the progress of slavery, and curtail the powers and influence of the slave States, is not the persuasion of the people of those States, but the numerical power of the free States acting through the Federal Government.

"The great principle upon which the Northern movement rests, which is already adopted by most northern politicians, and to which they all seem likely to be driven by the force of the popular current there, if the question is unsettled till the next Congressional election, is this: That the Government of the United States must do nothing to sanction slavery; that it must therefore exclude it from the Territories; that it must abolish it in the District of Columbia, forts, and arsenals, and wherever it has jurisdiction. Some, too, carrying the principle to its extent, insist that the coasting slave trade, and that between the States, should be abolished, and also in custom-houses, post-offices, and the like. As these things all obviously rest on the same general dogma, it is clear that the yielding of one or more points would not check, but would merely accelerate, the general movement to the end of the series. Before this end was reached, they would probably append, as a corollary, the principle that the President should not appoint a slaveholder to office. It is, sir, my deliberate judgment, that, in the present temper of the public mind at the North, if the

territorial question remains open till the next election, few, if any, gentlemen will get there from the free States, that are not pledged to the full extent of the abolition platform."—*Extract from a Speech in Congress, by T. L. Clingman, of North Carolina.*

The following report of what Mr. Clay said is from the National Intelligencer. The remarks are brief, but to the point. Mr. Clay says:—

"I cannot allow this occasion to pass without calling to the attention of the Senate a fact connected with most of these petitions. Sir, the moment a prospect opens in this unhappy country of settling our differences, these disturbers of the peace, these abolitionists put themselves in motion—the Jays, the Phillipses, and others in other quarters—and they establish a concerted and ramified plan of operations; and I want to expose it to the Senate. Here, sir, is a little bit of printed paper [holding up the petitions which had been delivered to him] scattered throughout the whole country. Some of them found their way into my own State. I presented them the other day from Lewis county, printed, I have no doubt, at a common centre, and dispersed throughout the country, in order to produce a common effect, and to make an impression on this body as if they were speaking the public sentiment in this country.

[After having been called to order by Mr. Hale, on the ground that the petition had already been passed upon, and after some conversation, in which Mr. Clay stated the rules to be, that the Senator might state the grounds of a motion before making it, and that he could

put himself in order by concluding with a motion to refer the petitions—he proceeded as follows:—]

"Well, sir, I do not know that I shall present any such motion, but I have a right to put myself in order by making such a motion, and I trust the honorable Senator, who is listened to by myself with as much complacency as any body, will not manifest any very great impatience at my calling the attention of the Senate to this ramified and concerted plan of the abolitionists to circulate their little bits of printed petitions adapted to all the variety of cases; one for abolishing the slave trade; one for abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia; one for removing the seat of government from this District; in every shape and mode in which they can bring up the question of slavery. I trust that neither the Senator nor his friends, in the house or out of the house, will manifest any great degree of impatience while I call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact, and show that the object is to manufacture a sort of public opinion in order to make an impression upon us at a moment when we are endeavoring to heal the wounds of the country and to reconcile its distracted and unhappy parts.

"Sir, of all the bitterest enemies toward the unfortunate negro race, there are none to compare with these abolitionist pretended friends of theirs; but who, like the Siamese twins, connect themselves with the negro, or, like the centaur of old, mount not the back of a horse, but the back of the negro to ride themselves into power, and in order to display a friendship they feel only for themselves, and not for the negro race. No, sir, there are no worse enemies in the country of the negro race

than these ultra abolitionists. To what sorts of extremity have they not driven the slave-holding States in defence of their own rights, and guarding against those excesses to which they have a constant tendency."

With them argument, and sophistry, and deception, have become exhausted, and they now resort to force. The principle for which they at this time contend, is the same as that upon which the society was originally organized, viz., *the unqualified abolition of slavery*, or the separation of the *free* from the *slave* States.* At a Free-Soil Convention, held at Fanieul Hall, Boston, March 6th, 1850, one of the

* "THE BANNER OF DISUNION UNFURLED.—We notice that the abolitionists, under the lead of Mr. Lloyd Garrison, the President of the American Anti-slavery Society, in their call for the Sixteenth annual meeting of their organization, which takes place in New York, on the 7th of May, makes the following announcement. These traitors are emboldened by the free-soil movement to persist in their audacious treason:

"A contest of near twenty years has proved that the only hopeful issue with slavery is the demand for the IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL EMANCIPATION OF EVERY SLAVE, and that such a consummation can never be attained so long as we maintain a political UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

"The northern boundary of the slave States is the same to-day that it was when the American Society came into existence; its Southern is extended Westward and Southward, embracing vast and fertile territories sufficient to insure its existence for centuries to come. It is something to be thankful and hopeful for, that the extension has not been without a struggle, and that struggle becomes daily more and more earnest and determined. It will be entirely successful when the North is awakened to the conviction that the ABOLITION OF SLAVERY will alone determine its extension—that the Southern and Western boundary will no longer be contended for when its Northern is destroyed."

orators, a genius named Willson, said: "We ought to come up with frankness to the point—*Union or no union, peace or war, victory or no victory!* Let us come up to-day and pledge ourselves that we will remain true to the principles we have adopted."

We subjoin one other tribute to the same sentiment of *disunion*. The following comment on the "*Death of Mr. Calhoun*," is from the *New York Anti-Slavery Standard*, the leading organ of the faction:—

"The Telegraph from Washington brings the intelligence of the death of John Caldwell Calhoun, the great champion of human bondage, and the leader of that party in the Republic which counted men as brutes, and which demands the sacrifice of the rights of the many to the power of the few. To his friends and equals, Mr. Calhoun has the reputation of having discharged, well and nobly, all the duties demanded by that relation; but to his inferiors, the servants of his household, though he may have fed and clothed them well,* he has been,

* Would that as much could be said of these beautiful models of consistency and philanthrophy (?) Are the servants of *their* households—their *equals* in birth, caste, and blood, and their *superiors* in natural goodness of heart, well fed and clothed? Will the pitiful remuneration which they receive for their labors, from these votaries of freedom and equal rights, enable them to supply themselves and families with the bare necessaries of life during the hours of sickness, and the cold, dreary months of winter? Will "a long, loud wail of bitter lamentation and deep sorrow," go up from the wretched hovels, the cold, crowded garrets and damp cellars, subterranean abodes of the poor and distressed, in their own immediate neighborhoods, when their death knells are sounded? Let the starving, perishing widows and orphans who inhabit these hovels give the answer.

from position and principle, a cruel and heartless tyrant. So far as he may have believed himself to be acting right, he is deserving of respect in having acted up to his belief; beyond that, he is only to be regarded as one who was a systematic robber of the poorest of God's children. *Better would it have been for the world, had he never been born; but having lived,* WE REGRET, *in his death, that he had not lived long enough to accomplish the object of his life*—THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION OF THESE STATES."

Thus we discover, that the only difference perceptible, is in the name, and in the "*modus operandi*" —the society having become better organized and more numerous, and, therefore, more dangerous. The advocate of Free Soilism is no other than an improved (?) disciple of the Garrisonian school. He who would exclude, by his vote, the slaveholder from a residence in the territories acquired by the common blood and treasure of the country, would harbor and encourage the flying fugitive, or contribute to a crusade against the legalized, inalienable rights and constitutional privileges of the Southern division of the Union. If not, he is not consistent with himself, as each is of a kindred nature, and alike violations of the organic law of the land. The friends of the South, of Southern rights and interests, can no longer stand and survey, with silent contempt and indignation, the secret workings and machinations of these detestable factionists and disorganizers. A well-organized system of opposition—not to the established

Constitution and Government under which we live—to the great Federal Union, which all should cherish and promote, as invaluable and sacred; but to their aggressions, or rather a system of protection to Southern interests and institutions, ought to receive the unqualified sanction and support of every American citizen, of every friend of humanity.

Let, then, every citizen of the slaveholding States, feel that he has a work to accomplish—that he is called upon by every feeling of interest, patriotism, and philanthropy, to organize, in self-defence, not against the Government or the Union, but for the protection of his family and fireside, his property and his most sacred rights, religious and political; against the midnight attacks and aggressions of an organized army of diabolical outlaws. Let him examine the ground upon which he stands, and the circumstances which surround him. Let him survey the length and the breadth, the huge and uncomely proportions of this hydra-headed monster of corruption, which threatens to swallow up the peace and prosperity, the property and privileges of the peaceful inhabitants of the Southern division of this great confederacy.

The Northern political reformers have assumed to legislate, with respect to the domestic institutions and policy of the South—to interfere with the rights of property, as guarantied by the Constitution of our common country. They propose to take from the slaveholder his slaves, which he has inherited from his ancestors, the honored dead, or purchased with

his money, without remuneration or satisfaction, and substitute, in their stead, *the rufuse population of the prisons and alms-houses of the old world;* than which a greater curse could not be inflicted upon any people. Are the order-loving, chivalrous citizens of the South prepared for this exchange? Will they sit supinely inactive, whilst a system of wholesale robbery of this character is being committed in their midst, upon their own property, and in their own households? Let the *future* action of the South, upon the subject, give the answer. Let the people of the slave States be no longer divided amongst themselves; let them forget all petty political differences, and, upon this subject, "know no party;" let them, as a band of brothers, become united in the common defence. Let them say, with one voice, to all abolitionists, of whatever name, sect, or party, "Tamper with us no longer." "Forbearance has ceased to be a virtue, and if civil commotions distract and divide us further, and our Confederacy is dissolved, and our Government subverted, the sin be upon *your heads.*"

A *dissolution* of the *Union*, has been the favorite theme of these factionists from their earliest organization. *Victory* or *Disunion*, peaceably if we can, but forcibly if we must, is enstamped upon their banners. They were the fathers and propagators of this treasonable doctrine of a division of the States. They have advocated it in their periodical conventions, upon the forum, in the social circle. The sacred

desk, too, has been profaned by sentiments of this character, from time immemorial, whilst their inflammatory publications have ceased not to herald them to the world upon every breeze. A base attempt has been made to shift the odium of this traitorous folly and madness to the South, and charge it upon the citizens of the slave States. Treason against the Government, they now declare, is combined with the unpardonable sin of slavery. Fellow-citizens, are you prepared for this? Do you plead guilty to the infamous charge? Is inconstancy to the Union, treason against the Government, a sin of Southern origin? Were Arnold and Burr men of Southern birth and education? Let the history of the past give the answer. Let the action of the future seal it with the same blood which has ever flowed in matchless profusion in the cause of liberty, in the cause of humanity, in the cause of our common country.

A call for a Southern convention is proclaimed, a convention in which citizens of the slaveholding States may meet, and deliberate as to the best manner of protecting their *own* domestic policy and institutions, of securing to themselves and posterity, the inalienable rights and privileges guarantied by the Constitution under which we live. Is there any thing criminal, treasonable, or anti-republican in this?* Abolitionists

* "As a Southern man, I cannot remain indifferent to the events that are daily transpiring in this country: events which are calculated, in my judgment, if not arrested, to distract, inflame, and perhaps destroy the Union of the States. When I hear a Southern man say, that he can

have assumed the right, from time immemorial, to hold conventions, and deliberate, not in respect to *their own* domestic policy and institutions alone, but (consistency, precious jewel!) in reference to the peculiar domestic policy and institutions of the South. The right to meet and deliberate respecting their *own* affairs, has

---

see nothing in the 'signs of the times' to authorize and justify the South, in adopting *strong measures* to repel the aggressions and outrages which are being made upon their rights, I am at once impressed with the conviction that he is obstinately blind, or an enemy to his own interests. Any man who is at all acquainted with public opinion at the North, with reference to the institution of slavery, must know that if the South does not make some demonstrations of willingness to maintain their rights under the Constitution, that ere long this great country will be plunged into a civil war. The question, then, springs up, How are the compromises of the Constitution to be preserved inviolate, and the Union preserved from destruction? The answer is at hand. Let the whole South, without distinction of party, meet together in convention, through properly authorized delegates, for the purpose of setting forth, in some authoritative manner, the line of conduct that necessity will compel them to adopt, if the North still persist in their aggressions and outrages. My opinion is, that the Northern fanatics will never cease their agitations, until the South shall convince them, by some overt act, that they will submit no longer to their unjust interference with their domestic affairs.

"The object of the Southern Convention, as I understand it, is not to dissolve the Union, or organize a Southern Confederacy, as some *miscreants* represent it, but simply to devise and agree upon some plan by which the distractions that now prevail in the country, may be healed, and render more permanent and secure the rights of the Southern portion of the Confederacy. Is there any thing treasonable or wrong in this? If it be treason to defend my rights from aggression, my property from destruction, and my home from desolation, then I am a traitor. But this hue and cry about treason, is said for the avowed purpose of blinding the eyes of the masses. As the whole South is vitally and deeply interested in the matter, let them take the management of their affairs in their own hands.

A SOUTHERNER."

never been questioned. But what do we now hear? Disunion! disunion! a Convention for the purpose of dissolving the Union! is the hue and cry of every abolition factionist and disorganizer throughout the length and breadth of the land. Fellow-citizens of the slaveholding States, are you prepared to be thus outwitted? to be thus cheated out of your inalienable rights and privileges?

A dissolution of the Union is undoubtedly the greatest calamity that could befall our hitherto happy and prosperous country. It is an event which no Christian patriot could ever contemplate for a moment, but with feelings of consternation and horror. It would be the signal for strife and contention, for anarchy and civil commotion, for blood and carnage amongst friends and brethren, amongst neighbors and fellow-citizens. "Thenceforth the American eagle would drop the olive branch of peace, and grasp only the arrows of war. The mountains that divide us, would be the dark mountains of death; and the stream that flows between, like the waters of Egypt, would be turned into blood. The hand that writes the declaration of disunion, may it feel the blood curdle in its veins; and the tongue which reads it to the world, may it stiffen in the act."

All the great National, State, and individual interests of the country, are opposed to disunion. The political and commercial relations of the States, combine to show that their natural and only true policy is union; the geographical, that the God of nature never designed

the territory of the North American Continent to be, like the grand divisions of the old world, inhabited by different kingdoms, nations, and empires. The great natural characteristics of the new world, are on a grand and magnificent scale. Upon our northern boundary are the great lakes, in magnitude and depth unequalled, united in an indissoluble chain, pouring their exhaustless fountains over the same stupendous cataract, through the same channel, in the bosom of the same great ocean; at the extreme south the two great oceans flow well nigh together, as if to blend their waves in one. Our mountains, which rank among the most towering of the globe, roll on in one unbroken chain from the polar to the torrid regions; whilst our majestic rivers extend from centre to circumference, interlocking their innumerable branches together, as if in token of union. To advocate *disunion*, would be to mar the whole order and beauty of nature, to subvert the laws of the material universe, and insult the wisdom of Deity. He who would harbor the inhuman, sacrilegious thought, let him be anathematized by heaven; let him receive the mark of Cain, and be driven from the pale of civilized society, to wander a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth. Let the Constitution be preserved inviolate, so long as it can be done, in harmony with the spirit which brought it into being.

INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY ON THE PROSPERITY OF THE STATES.—Much has been said and written respect-

ing the influence of slavery on the general prosperity and advancement of the States where it exists. Unwarrantable comparisons have been made, and unjustifiable conclusions formed, by those who understood not the relative condition of the free and the slave States, nor the causes which operated to produce the difference which actually exists. The contrast between Kentucky and Ohio, for example, has been often drawn, and the real difference magnified to an extent, which would well nigh justify the conclusion that they existed in different ages, in different climes, and under different forms of government.

That there is a difference between these two States, taking into consideration their ages as States, we are free to admit; but, that that difference is wholly owing to the fact of one being a *slave*, and the other a *free* State, is false, both in principle and in fact. If this were true, the same principle would hold good when applied to different counties and sections of Kentucky itself. But that it is not true, facts clearly demonstrate; for, by examination into this matter, we find that in the wealthiest, most intelligent, and refined sections of that State, as well as of any of the slave States, the greatest proportion of slaves are to be found. We can cite to counties, and to parts of counties, and, indeed, to individual cases, and in every instance show that there is a marked difference in favor of the slaveholder, when confined to the native born citizens of the State.

Ohio, it is true, has more flourishing towns and cities, and has increased more rapidly in population than

Kentucky. It is also true, that there is more poverty and pauperism, in proportion to the population; and more taxation, in proportion to her aggregate wealth and improvements, than there is in Kentucky. This fact will hold good in comparing any town, city, and manufacturing population, with that of the peaceful inhabitants of the country engaged in the healthful, ennobling, and life-giving pursuits of agriculture, horticulture, &c. Towns, cities, and manufacturing districts, are the hot-beds of vice, misery, pauperism, and degradation. It is there the extremes of wealth and poverty meet; it is there that corruption and human wretchedness are presented in their most loathsome forms.* Says COLEMAN, in his most estimable work on AGRICULTURE:—

"The great cause of the evils which afflict humanity, and the multiplication of crime, and the disorders of society, he attributes to the fact, that 'the cultivation of the earth is deserted, and innumerable multitudes pour

* "They now find it staring them in the face, from the reports of their own officers, that there is an amount of degradation (shameless and incurable, because beginning with the beginning of life,) existing within *one* city's (New York) limits, greater than can be gathered in the whole population of the slaveholding States." "In the slave States of this country, there is less of it than any where else in the world. In fact, there is no such things as poverty, want, and starvation, among the slaves Such degradation and misery as are pictured in the report of the Chief of our Police, cannot exist in a Southern city." "It is to be hoped, now that those philanthropists know how miserable and degraded New York is—and all large free cities are equally bad—they will turn their attention to the work of making it better, before they make Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, and New Orleans worse."—*New York Day Book.*

into cities and towns, and filling every mechanical art and trade, destroy each other by a competition in articles of which the demand is necessarily limited."

But to what is the difference between these States attributable, if not to the fact of the one being a *slave*, and the other a *free* State? It is said, that the one, though much younger, has a population more than double that of the other. There must be some cause or causes for this marked difference. There is, unquestionably. That it is not altogether attributable, however, to the one alluded to, is evident from the fact, that other newly-settled portions of our vast domain, have as far surpassed Ohio, in point of rapid increase of population, as Ohio has Kentucky. It must be true, then, that the difference manifest in the relative prosperity of different States and sections of the Union, is attributable to other causes than that of the existence of slavery.

What, then, are these causes in the case of these two States? One very important circumstance, which has doubtless operated more effectually to retard the progress of general improvement in the State of Kentucky than any or all others, was the fact of her territory having been originally a part of Virginia. This circumstance, or rather circumstances growing out of this, gave rise to an almost *unending warfare respecting the title of most lands within her boundary.* Large and conflicting individual surveys having been made previous to her separation from Virginia, gave rise to a state of things of a most unfortunate and

discouraging character, and which were measurably unknown in the settlement of any other State. Indeed, it is matter of doubt, whether any other than the valiant Boone and his gallant compatriots and their posterity, ever would have surmounted these difficulties. The wealthy proprietors of those immense surveys were mostly citizens of other States, and being uninfluenced by any of the motives which proximity of residence, and a common feeling of interest in the general welfare and prosperity of the State as citizens, would have naturally engendered; they waged a combined warfare against the hardy emigrant, which few but a Kentucky pioneer ever would have withstood. In a multitude of instances, after having penetrated the dark recesses of the forest, and driven the wild beast, and the wilder savage, from their strong holds and native haunts—after having surmounted all the many difficulties of a pioneer settler, and erected for himself and dependents a comfortable home, and reduced to cultivation a large farm; he was compelled to pay for his lands a second, third, and perhaps fourth time, or forsake all, without "the hope of fee or reward," and, in his old age, again penetrate the wilderness and commence anew, with the same uncertainty of being able to hold what he might purchase, and obtain by a similar outlay of money and labor.

Thus have we a brief and imperfect description of the difficulties against which the early settlers of Kentucky, and, indeed, many of the slave States, had to contend—difficulties which existed not in the early

settlement of Ohio, and most of the other north-western States, where the settler derived the title of his lands direct from the general government. Indeed, in some portions of Kentucky, land litigation is not yet ended, and many an honest farmer knows neither the day nor the hour that he may be called upon to give up his home, or compromise with some foreign, "land-jobber" at a heavy sacrifice.

The early settler of Ohio experienced nothing of all this. Invited to his home by the superior fertility of the soil, the mere nominal government price of $1 25 per acre, and the additional inducement of every sixteenth section being set apart for the education of his children, combined with the fact of the title to the land being indisputable; the wonder would have been, had not the State increased rapidly in population. Whereas, the entirely different state of things in the early settlement of Kentucky, doubtless retarded her general improvement *twice*, if not *thrice* the length of time that intervened between the adoption of the two States into the Union. This cause alone, other circumstances being equal, is well nigh sufficient to justify the actual difference which is obvious in the general prosperity of the two States.

But there is another cause of almost equal magnitude. Kentucky, like most of the slave States, is decidedly, or has been, thus far in her history, an agricultural State. Her leading interests are indentified with the cultivation of the soil. Her wealth, consequently, does not tend to concentrate in cities and towns, and is not,

therefore, as fascinatingly displayed as in her more youthful rival, Ohio. Her population is much more sparse, her citizens having inherited, from their natural ancestors, the patriotic, hospitable planters of the "Old Dominion," an inherent desire to hold large bodies of land. This peculiar feature of their organization contributes materially to affect her general prosperity. The more wealthy, as their means will permit, seek to enlarge their farms by purchasing the lands of their less fortunate neighbors; thus driving them to other States, or to less eligible and valuable situations within their own limits. This circumstance has contributed largely to drain off the population. Thus, for many years past, the tide of emigration has been *from* instead of *to* the State.

Another evil, growing out of this custom, is this: It is in a large number, perhaps a majority of instances, an *injudicious investment of capital.* Many have continued this course until their lands have increased far beyond their ability to cultivate them. The result is, that the lands are made to yield a very small per cent. on their nominal value, and the state is impoverished, not only by a decrease of her population, but by the resources of her rich and fertile lands being very imperfectly developed by an injudicious and often almost ruinous system in cultivation. Thus, much the greater portion of the surplus capital of the State is lying comparatively dormant; whereas, if those large farms were reduced to a size proportionate to the force employed to cultivate them, the landholders would become

much more numerous, the farming population would be much increased, this would lead to a proportionate increase in the population of the towns and cities,—as these increased an enlarged home demand for the farmer's products would be created, and thus would all work together, harmoniously, for the common good of every class of citizens.

As these land monopolies become broken up, and the farms reduced to a size which would enable each farmer to cultivate, judiciously, whatever land he might chance to own, the resources of the soil would be much better developed, and the aggregate wealth and population of the State would be greatly increased. The surplus resources of capitalists would then seek investments in manufactures and commerce, in the development of the mineral resources of the State, and in the construction of public works of internal improvement; all of which, if properly managed, would prove a far more profitable investment of capital, and would contribute greatly to the general improvement and prosperity of the State at large. Experience has clearly demonstrated the fact, that capital, judiciously invested in manufactures, in the slave State, is as productive as in the free, whether the labor made use of be free or slave labor. Investments in bank stock, have proved eminently profitable: and the salutary influence of judiciously managed public works, upon the general improvement and prosperity of the slave States, is also fully established. These have been generally constructed at a much heavier outlay of capital, than in

some of the northern free States; not because the one were free, and the other slave States, but because of a want of experience in the construction of such works, the sparseness of the population, the greater natural difficulties to be surmounted, and the much greater length to which those improvements must necessarily be extended, to form connecting links between important commercial points. Yet, notwithstanding all these opposing circumstances, the fact is clearly established, that the construction of rail-roads, and other works of internal improvement in the slave States, may be made both practicable and profitable; and we believe the time is not far distant, when these iron bands of commercial intercourse will traverse the sunny regions of the South, as well as the sterile plains of the North—when the world's thoroughfare, connecting the Atlantic with the great Pacific, upon which will concentrate the combined commerce of the earth, all tending to that modern Ophir, whose exhaustless treasures have already aroused the cupidity of the most powerful nations of the globe—we say, the time is not far distant, when this mighty triumph of American enterprise, together with the world's great speaking trumpet, the magnetic telegraph, will be extended from the Mississippi to the Californians, from the Atlantic to the Pacific shore, mostly, if not wholly, upon slave territory. This we speak of, not boastingly, but as a natural result of the present existing state of things, which the combined efforts of abolitionists and free-soilers, and all the heterogeneous mass of conflicting elements and powers,

which may be brought to co-operate with them, cannot avert. This unnatural conflict of folly and madness may be continued, until the heart strings of the nation are rent assunder, and our grand confederacy dissolved. But whether, in this event, the South would be the loser, is a question which, at least, admits of discussion. She has within herself the elements of a great nation—a mighty empire, which such a result would, doubtless, tend rapidly to develope. And we doubt not, that, in a few years, she would exhibit to the world a model government, combining as many of the elements of true greatness as any that ever existed; while her chivalrous citizens would possess the patriotism, the independence, and the invincible courage to defend her against the combined powers of the earth. Many other considerations might be enumerated, but these, we trust, are sufficiently conclusive, to prove, to the satisfaction of every candid, honest, unprejudiced mind, that the differences which apparently exist between the general increase, prosperity, and improvement of the slave States and the free, are attributable not alone to the existence of slavery.*

But we are told that slavery is an evil.† So is war an evil. And, viewing it in the same light, government may also be considered an evil, since it is an abridge-

* For an abler and more extended examination of this subject, see Lecture on North and South, by Elwood Fisher.

† "NEGRO SLAVERY NO EVIL.—The fearless, prompt, and always direct Senator from Louisiana, General Downs, in his recent speech on

ment of liberty. Yet have they both received the sanction, and continue to exist, by the appointment of an all-wise and beneficent Providence. There is, probably, not a succession of seasons, of day and night, of sunshine and storm, which we cannot find some portion of the human family ready to denounce as evil: yet were they all ordained in wisdom, and are continued unto us in mercy. The world in which we live has much of evil in it, and, as rational beings, we often have the power of making a choice of evils. Between the evils of slavery, and any of the evil systems of abolition and emancipation which have ever yet been submitted to the American people, we fancy we discover a marked difference—that of slavery being an evil of much less magnitude—attended with fewer unhappy

---

the slavery question, makes the following remarks, replete with the good sense he always exhibits:—

"If slavery was an evil, which he did not admit, it was not to be increased by diffusing it. The evil would be increased by confining it within narrow bounds.

"But so far from considering slavery an evil, as even some southern men did, he deemed it a very useful institution. It was not to be believed that we were wiser than those who had gone before us. Had slavery in the United States rendered any African less happy than he would be if free? Slavery was the only step in progress ever made by Africa. There had been advancements everywhere on the globe except in Africa. Slavery in America was the only thing that had ever benefitted unfortunate Africa.

"But these slaves, so much sympathized with, were happy and comfortable in their condition. They were the gayest, most happy, best fed, and best clothed laboring population in the whole world. They were, in fact, a much happier people than their masters. They had no care for the future, and their labors were light and cheerfully performed."

consequences to both races.* We would, therefore, act the part of wisdom, and of many evils choose the least—it being the *abuse* and not the legitimate *use* of the institutions wisely ordained by God, and sanctioned by human experience, that constitute the evil growing out of them.

---

* "Sir, if any evils have grown out of the existence of slavery, they have not at least affected the North. During the days of slave trade, which (as I formerly had occasion to remark) was continued down to 1808, by New England votes in the convention, the northern ship-owners realized large profits by purchasing negroes on the coast of Africa at thirty or forty dollars per head, and selling them to southern planters for several hundred dollars. The bringing in of these slaves caused large tracts of the southern country, too unhealthy to have been cleared out by white men, to be brought under profitable cultivation. The price of cotton has thereby been brought down from fifty, to ten, and even five cents per pound. An immense amount of capital and labor is employed profitably in its manufacture at the North. In England, also, not less than six hundred millions of dollars is thus invested, and a vast population exists by being employed in the manufacture. It is ascertained that at least five millions of white persons, in Europe and this country, get their employment, are fed, and exist, on the manufacture of cotton alone. The cheap southern production of the raw material not only is the means of thus giving subsistence to a great portion of the population of this country and Europe, but is clothing the world at a cheap rate. In addition to cotton, rice, sugar, coffee, tobacco, and various tropical productions are supplied at a cheap rate for northern consumption. On the other hand, our slaves seldom come in competition with northern labor, and are good customers of its productions. While the North has derived these great advantages, the negroes themselves have not been sufferers. Their condition not only compares most advantageously with that of the laboring population of the world, but is in advance of the position they have been able, at any time, to occupy at home. The researches of Gliddon and other antiquarians, show that four thousand years ago in Africa they were slaves, and black as they now are. Since then, in that country, where they were placed by Providence, and where, from peculiar constitution, they enjoy the best health, they have existed only as savages. They are there continually made slaves by the men of more intelligent

Slavery, when considered with reference to the white race alone, may be considered an evil. There is, probably, no species of property which is so troublesome, hazardous, and expensive, and subject to so many contingencies, as negro slave property. The slave requires constant care and attention upon the part of the master. He must be fed, and clothed, and nursed, during the years of infancy and childhood, and the hours of sickness. There is no passive state. If not actively employed, he is a bill of expense, an object of earnest solicitude, for whose every overt act the master is held accountable. A more responsible, perplexing situation, can hardly be imagined, than that of an individual surrounded by a large number of slaves of all ages, who are dependent upon him, both in sickness and in health—in helpless infancy and decrepit old age, for food, clothing, and, indeed, all the necessaries of life. Let flood or fire, famine or pestilence, or whatever of the manifold evils and

---

and enterprising races. Nor have they ever gotten out of the tropical parts of Africa, except when they were carried as merchandise. It remains to be proved, however, yet to the world, that the negro, any more than the horse, can permanently exist, in a state of freedom, out of a tropical region. Their decay at the North, as well as other circumstances which I have not time to detail, are adverse to the proposition. And yet, sir, the journals of the North, while they deny that the French and the Germans, the most enlightened of the continental nations of Europe, are capable of freedom, stoutly maintain that the negro is; the negro, who has never anywhere, when left to himself, gotten up to the respectable state of barbarism which all the other races have attained, not even excepting our Indians in Mexico and Peru."

misfortunes to which human life is incident, come upon him or them, *he* alone is the principal sufferer.

The wholesome and salutary laws and customs of the slave States, instead of leaving the slave, who constitute the *laboring class*, when a child of misfortune, dependent upon the cold charities of the world, or the meagre provisions of the poor-house, or the charity hospital, require that the master should minister to his necessities, and succor him in affliction. Often is it the case, that men of wealth, thus situated, become, by these misfortunes alone, seriously involved in debt, and, in some instances, reduced to a state of bankruptcy. Indeed, we have been sometimes led to regard it as a matter of surprise, that slaveholders did not, for their own sakes, turn their slaves loose upon the world at all hazards, and thus rid themselves of a species of property which was only evil and that continually. But this, their own inherent sense of propriety, their regard for the peace and safety of their families and fellow-citizens, and, above all, the common feelings of humanity, prompted by their native sympathy for the benighted negro, whom they know by a correct estimate of his mental inferiority and consequent incapability to buffet with the conflicting elements of life, and protect and secure for himself and family the necessaries of a comfortable subsistence, would not permit him to do. Remove these difficulties, and provide for the slave an asylum—a land adapted, in climate and soil, to the peculiarities of his nature, where he may enjoy the rights of citizenship and the protection of our govern-

ment; and thousands of Christian slaveholders, prompted by Christian benevolence, pure as that crystal fountain which emanates from the throne of redeeming love, will, despite the sacrifice of property, emancipate their slaves, and thus free *themselves* from the evils of slavery.

But there is another evil of much greater magnitude, one in the estimate of which dollars and cents cannot be taken into the account. This is an evil growing not so much out of the institution of slavery, as out of the existence of the black race among the whites, whether in a state of bondage or freedom. The grovelling and corrupting tendency of the negro's mind, his proneness to sensual indulgence, and the unrestricted gratification of the baser propensities of his nature, render his existence, in every community, without regard to his relative position, an evil of the most serious character.

It has been alleged, by abolitionists, that the marriage relation is not recognized by the laws of slavery, and that the sacred rights appertaining thereto are violated with impunity. But this is not true; custom and public sentiment, the parents of law, having established those in such a manner, that they are seldom disregarded by the slaveholders, except in extreme cases; whilst, by the blacks themselves, they are as seldom ever regarded or observed. This want of virtue and constancy, on the part of these people, has a most demoralizing and corrupting influence upon the youth, of whatever community they exist to any extent, whether as freemen or

bondmen. The existence of any inferior class of people in any community, a people who are incapable of any voice in the government under which they live, between whom and the legitimate citizens of the country there is an impassable barrier, has ever been considered an evil of no minor consideration.

But especially is this the case, where imbecility of intellect, and an unrestricted indulgence of the baser passions and propensities of their nature constitute the highest ambition of that people. Many evils, of a less baneful character, have attracted the attention of existing functionaries of the government, and been the subject of legislative action; and the question remains to be solved, Why should not this?

But there is an evil abroad in our land, which, next to abolitionism itself, is the greatest positive evil, of a social character, known to an American citizen. Like the memorable outpourings of Divine wrath upon the ancient Egyptians, which passed every threshold, and left its blighting impress upon every family circle; so the curse of which we speak is one which has a deleterious influence upon almost every member of every community in which it exists. We allude to the existence of the free *black population* in the United States, than which a more indolent, degraded, corrupting, miserable class of beings does not exist within the pale of civilized society. Destitute of moral principle, and devoid of native energy, their mode of life is in unison with the base propensities of their nature, which they seek alone to gratify.

To elevate such a race of beings to a political equality with the white population, would be suicidal in the extreme; it would be but applying the torch to that political magazine, whose inevitable explosion would destroy our whole grand superstructure of boasted liberty, and rend to atoms the noblest form of civil government the world ever saw. Such an attempt, we trust, will never receive the sanction of an American citizen. It is fraught with the most disastrous consequences, as all past experience clearly demonstrates. These people are drones upon society; nay, worse; they are a curse to every community in which *they* exist. Their existence in the slave States is an evil of the first magnitude. They tend to render worse than worthless, more than an equal number of slaves, without contributing one iota to the amelioration of the condition of the slave, however wretched that condition may chance to be. It is, therefore, the bounden duty of every friend of humanity, to labor for their entire removal from our midst.

We repeat: Their presence is a universal evil, destructive alike to the peace, morality, safety, and prosperity of every community in which they are to be found, whether existing in a free or a slave State. In this respect, they are upon the same footing as the red man of the forest; but, being of a race naturally inferior, their existence in our midst is more to be deprecated than would be that of the Indian. Extend to him the same degree of civilization, and inure him, from childhood, to the same habits of industry, and he

will make a citizen neighbor much less objectionable, in every point of view, than the negro.

The condition of the free negro, in the free States, is generally much worse than that of the same class of persons, whether free or slave, in the slave States.* The severity of the climate being much less adapted to natural peculiarities of his constitution, and the price which he can receive for his services when disposed or compelled by necessity to labor—these, combined with the fact, that there is much less sympathy for him, and much less charity extended towards him by the citizens of the free, than of the slave States, combine to render his condition, in almost every respect, infinitely worse in the North than in the South.†

---

* This whole action on the part of the North is not only in violation of the Constitution, but seems to be purely wanton, or originating in malice towards the South. It is obvious that they do not want our slaves among them; because they not only make no adequate provisions for their comfort, but, in fact, in many of the States, have forbidden free negroes to come among them on pain of imprisonment, &c. It cannot be a desire to liberate slaves, because they have never, to my knowledge, attempted to steal negroes from Cuba or Brazil. It is true, however, that having the right now to come amongst us both by land and water, they have greater advantages and immunities. For if they went into a foreign country, they would incur the risk of being shot or hanged, as robbers and pirates usually are.

† "FREE NEGROES IN THE SOUTH.—Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, observed, in the United States Senate, on the 8th, that the free colored persons in South Carolina were in possession of civil rights, could hold property, claim the protection of the laws, &c. Many of the colored persons in South Carolina, he added, held slaves.

"All this exists, to a much greater extent, in Louisiana, where an immense amount of property is held by colored persons. There are many colored men in New Orleans who are worth from fifty to one hundred and

We aver, without the fear of successful refutation, that the negro, whether bondman or freeman, has more true, devoted *friends* in the South than in the North—among the slaveholders than among the harping abolitionists; and that his condition, regardless of the relation of slavery and freedom, is more tolerable in hands of the former than of the latter. We are aware that there are exceptions to all general rules; but we confidently believe, that where an exception exists in the one case, a corresponding state of wretchedness and degradation may be found in the other.*

Instances of the kind have occurred, and, if not prevented by physical force, would occur in hundreds and thousands of cases again, where, after the slave has been decoyed away from a comfortable home with a kind master, by some unprincipled fanatic, and carried to the land "flowing with milk and honey," as represented to him; finding himself deceived in every essential particular, respecting the nature of the change, he has torn himself away from the snare into which he has been enticed, fought his way back with a fortitude and bravery amounting almost to desperation,

---

fifty thousand dollars, and they are treated with infinitely more respect and consideration than they would receive in the Northern cities—they enjoy all the protection and rights of the law, so far as their persons and property are concerned, but cannot hold office or serve as jurors. In no free city of the Union, do free colored persons maintain a higher standing than in New Orleans."—*New Orleans Bulletin.*

* "This conclusion is based upon observations made during several years' residence in various parts of the two different sections of the Union.

and returned to the home of his youth, the seat of his early affections and associations, satisfied that the best friend he has on earth is a kind master. The reason why there is more sympathy, charity, and fellow feeling existing in the heart of the slaveholder towards the negro, is obvious. Raised together from infancy, passed the period of childhood in the enjoyment of the same sports, their associations the same, their feelings become united, to a certain extent—there springs up between them a kind of natural sympathy and regard for each other, which is as enduring as life itself. From childhood's early dawn, they both imbibe a correct idea of the relation of master and slave, which continues with them through life. Let their relations become changed, it matters not how materially, this idea is never eradicated. If the slave ever forgets his obligations, so far as to become refractory, the punishment is summary and conclusive; and a return to his duty and allegiance, restores him to favor.

How different the condition of the fugitive slave, or free black man of the North. Without the pale of civilized society, unprotected, and unqualified to protect himself, the most he can accomplish by hard labor, a rigid system of economy, and a frugal disposition of his time, is to obtain a bare and meagre subsistence. The chilling blasts of long, dreary winter come, or the burning fever of disease, and no kind hand is extended to shelter or afford relief. If cared for at all, when reduced to a state of utter helplessness, he is carried off to the *poor-house*, receiving the imprecations of

those who have been taxed to excess, to maintain the pauperism of their own wretched victims of poverty and distress.

Thus is it with the *free black man*, wheresoever dispersed. He is an outcast upon society, and his name a reproach to humanity. His *removal*, then, becomes a matter of deep and abiding interest and importance to every friend of humanity, to every patriot and Christian throughout the broad expanse of Christendom. Much is being done by the Christian world for the cause of suffering humanity in all parts of the earth. The benighted inhabitants of the most distant ice-bound shore, and the remotest sea-girt isle, are beginning to stretch forth their hands in answer to the call of the Christian missionary, and the light of civilization is penetrating the deepest recesses of heathenish darkness; whilst a copy of the Holy Scriptures is being laid upon the table of almost every householder in Christendom. But here is a field opened for the exercise of pure benevolence, and true Christian charity, in our own immediate midst. Here is common ground, upon which all sects and parties, the votaries of every variety of religious faith and political policy, may meet and join hands in a great and good cause. As it is an evil which pervades the whole body politic, its removal is a work in which every American citizen is deeply interested. It is the first step towards the removal of that which many are pleased to regard as the blackest stain upon the bright escutcheon of American glory; the great national sin, the punish-

ment of which will render our country obnoxious to the severest outpourings of Divine wrath—namely: Slavery.

Many ways and means have already been devised for the removal of the free black population. But there is only one correct way of removing them, and that is by colonization. The great scheme of the American Colonization Society, is the only means by which this evil ever can be eradicated from our land. That is a plan which was dictated by pure benevolence and true Christian charity, and founded in wisdom; and which is characteristic, like the *magna charta* of American liberty, of the great minds that originated it. Experience may suggest some modifications in some of its practical features, and doubtless will; but yet it is the true and only successful policy. It may become necessary to select some other destination than the colony of Liberia, or to require the government thereof to be administered by a functionary chosen by a congress of nations. But let what changes may come in that respect, *colonization, a complete and perfect separation of the two races,** is the only true policy. We lay it down as a settled principle, a *fixed fact*, and challenge the world to refute it, that the Anglo-Saxon, and the African races, *never can* live harmoniously, in a

* "It is objected, that there would be injustice and inhumanity in the forcible removal of the free blacks. But not greater, we conceive, than were displayed in the removal of the Indians. These possessed a right to the soil which was prior to all others; yet did our government conceive it to be policy and justice to remove them.

state of political equality. If they dwell together at all, it must be in the relation of master and slave. Heaven ordained it thus, and man, in all his wisdom and strength of intellect, never can change it. Nor is there greater injustice displayed in this arrangement or dispensation of divine Providence, than there is in the organization of human government, wherein one part of the human race is ordained to rule over and give laws to another.

> Heaven in wisdom ordained it thus,
> And man, submissive, must pronounce it just.

We have asserted, that the removal of the free black population can only be effected by colonization, and that the plan of the American Colonization Society was based upon the correct principle. It may then be asked, Why does it not succeed? It has been in operation for many years, and yet has accomplished but little, compared with the great work before it. True; yet it has accomplished much. It has opened the way, "removed the rubbish," and laid the corner stone, and now only wants the means necessary to the completion of the temple. For all this time was requisite; and it is a pleasing reflection to know, that the success fully justifies the labor and expense of the enterprise. All that is now wanting to complete the great work, is unity of action, and means to carry out what has been thus successfully commenced, or, in other words, *governmental protection* and *patronage*. But the work is of a magnitude too vast and comprehensive, to be accom-

plished by individual enterprise. The evil to be removed is of a general character—it is a national evil, extending throughout the whole length and breadth of the land. The resources of the nation, the funds of the general government, the coffers of the common treasury, ought, therefore, to be appropriated to its removal. Let no one be alarmed at this—we speak not without precedent. Similar appropriations, for similar purposes, have been made by our national Congress, when composed of as wise, patriotic, and noble spirits, as ever glittered in the galaxy of human greatness.

The time was, when the red man of the forest, the noble Indian, the proud aboriginee, who derived his *right* to the soil which we now inhabit, by tenure of a grant from the God of nature, was dispersed abroad throughout the land. As the soil which he occupied, and the air which he breathed, began to be wanted by his superior in intellect, in science, and in art, the general government furnished the means, and assumed the responsibility of removing him to territories more congenial to *his* pursuits of life, and less valuable to *her legal* citizens.

There now exists amongst us the remnant of a race, whose residence in our midst is not less inimical to the feelings and interests of the white population, than were the Indians. What, then, is the duty of the general government in regard to them? Does it not come as much within the purview of its legitimate functions to remove in the one case as the other? Are there any reasons which operated in the removal of the

Indian, that may not be brought to bear, with equal force, in the removal of the negro? If so, we maintain, that the stronger reasons are favorable to the removal of the free blacks. The common feelings of humanity towards them, as an unfortunate people; whose destiny is fixed, whose name is a reproach and a by-word, who can never be allowed a voice in the administration of the government under which they live, together with the demoralizing, degenerating influence which their existence in our midst has upon society; all point to them as an object worthy the attention of the general government. Their numbers are large; their colonization, therefore, is beyond the reach of individual enterprise. The government, the world, have no right to effect its accomplishment by such means, whilst our citizens have the right to expect and *demand* it at the hands of the government. The latter possesses the power, and her resources are abundantly ample. The objection, that the general government has not the means for so great a work, is entirely futile. A small tithe of what is annually expended in injurious legislation or misguided appropriations, would carry on the work. Indemnification to the South for the actual losses sustained by her citizens,* by the aggression of Northern

* "Compared with this great question, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia is of little relative moment. One effect, however, of the anti-slavery agitation here is worthy of a passing notice. Within the last two years, since the matter has become serious, it has seemed not improbable that the seat of Government might be removed from the District. As this would be extremely prejudicial to the interests of the citizens here, many of them have so far changed in their feelings as

fanatics, would contribute materially towards affecting the same great object. Add to this a tenth of the value of the magnificent cessions made by Virginia to

---

to be willing to allow slavery to be abolished, yielding to the force of the pressure from the North; besides, so many of their slaves are from time to time taken away by the abolitionists, as to satisfy them that such property here is almost worthless. A great impression was made on them by the coming in last year of a northern ship, and its carrying away seventy slaves at once. Seeing that there was no chance of getting Congress to pass any adequate law for their protection, as most of the States have done, they seemed to be forced to assent, to some extent, to the northern movement. Sir, it is most surprising, that the people of the southern States should have borne, with so little complaint, the loss of their slaves incurred by the action of the free States. The Constitution of the United States provided for the delivery of all such fugitives, and Congress passed an act to carry it into effect; but recently, most, if not all of the northern States, have completely defeated their provisions, by forbidding any one of their citizens to aid in the execution of the law, under the penalty of fine and imprisonment, for as long a term usually as five years. There is, probably, no one legal mind in any one of the free States, which can regard these laws as constitutional. For, though the States are not bound to legislate affirmatively, in support of the Constitution of the United States, yet it is clear that they have no right to pass laws to obstruct the execution of constitutional provisions. Private citizens are not usually bound to be active in execution of the law: but, if two or more combine to prevent the execution of any law, they are subject to indictment for conspiracy, in all countries where the common law doctrine prevail. If the several States could rightfully legislate to defeat the action of Congress, they might, thereby, completely nullify most of its laws. In this particular instance such has been the result; for, though the master is allowed to go and get his negro if he can; yet, in point of fact, it is well known that the free negroes, abolitionists, and other disorderly persons, acting under the countenance and authority of the State laws, are able, usually, to overpower the master and prevent his capture.

"The extent of the loss to the South may be understood from the fact, that the number of runaway slaves, now in the North, is stated as being thirty thousand; worth, at present prices, little short of fifteen millions of dollars. Suppose that amount of property was taken away from the

the general government, and the work is completed. It is estimated, that there exist in the United States, about four hundred thousand free blacks; (by the census of 1840, there were three hundred and eighty-six thousand, two hundred and ninety-three.) At fifty dollars per head, the ratio fixed by the American Colonization Society, their entire removal would cost twenty millions of dollars; but as their colonization is not the work of a day or a year, but of a series of years, only a small portion of this amount would be required at any one time. Say it could be accomplished in *ten* years, which is probably the shortest practicable period, two millions of dollars annually would be required; a mere nominal sum, surely, when compared with the actual resources of the government. This amount may be raised by direct appropriations from the

---

North by the Southern States acting against the Constitution: what complaint would there not be; what memorials, remonstrances and legislative resolutions would come down upon us? How would this Hall be filled with lobby members, coming here to press their claims upon Congress? Why, sir, many of the border counties in the slaveholding States have been obliged to give up their slaves almost entirely. It was stated in the newspapers the other day, that a few counties named, in Maryland, had, by the efforts of the abolitionists, within six months, upon computation, lost one hundred thousand dollars worth of slaves. A gentleman of the highest standing, from Delaware, assured me the other day, that that little State lost, each year, at least that value of such property in the same way. A heavy tax to be levied on a single congressional district by abolitionists!

"Suppose a proportional burden was inflicted on the northern States. How would Massachusetts bear the loss annually of one million one hundred thousand dollars, not only inflicted without law, but against an express provision of the Constitution? We may infer, from the complaint she has made of a slight inconvenience imposed on her, by that regulation of South Carolina, which prevented ship-captains from carrying free negro servants to Charleston."—*Speech of T. L. Clingman, of North Carolina.*

common treasury, or by setting apart a portion of the proceeds of the sales of the public domain, or in any other manner which the wisdom of our national Legislature, or a majority of the State Legislatures may deem most expedient. Can it be that a government, having millions of acres of fine arable lands to *donate* to colonies composed of the refuse population of the old world; and millions of treasure to expend in fruitless expeditions in search of one who, in all human probability, is long since dead; is destitute of the means requisite to the accomplishment of an object involving every principle of humanity, and security, and protection to all classes of her citizens? Might not a tithe of the millions of gold which are annually being purloined from the rich mines of California, by the mongrel races of other nations, for want of the natural protection of the government, be saved and appropriated to this very laudable and philanthropic object?

The work may be carried on through the instrumentality of the American Colonization Society, or through any other agency which may be found most safe, economical, and expeditious. (The pre-possessions of the writer are in favor of the former, from the consideration, that the Society has made the experiment, and fully tested the feasibility of the enterprise.) The transportation may be continued to the *now* flourishing (?) colony of Liberia, or it may be changed to some other destination, if, in the wisdom of our Government, a change should be deemed expedient. Future developments, in the progress of that colony, or considerations of economy or protection to the colonists,

may indicate a less remote destination. It may be considered wise and politic, on the part of our government, to purchase and set apart for that purpose, the Island of Cuba, some portion of Mexico, Central or South America, or some portion of territory comprised within the present boundary of our vast domain. Let what may be done in this respect, the emergencies of the case require immediate and decisive action, in relation to this matter. Justice to the free negro and to the slave, to the slaveholder* of the South, and the non-slaveholder of the North, to suffering humanity as presented in its most revolting character, imperiously demand it at the hands of the existing functionaries of the government.

In our limited sphere, as a private citizen, we are unable to do more than suggest the idea, to mark out the frame work, the skeleton of a great system of national, moral, and social reform, which, in the hands of those who have the skill and ability, the influence and the power, to reduce it to form and practice, would be productive of incalculable advantages to the present and all future generations. Colonization, the transportation of the civilized and educated free black population of the United States, to the shores of Africa, will, undoubtedly, prove the key to the civilization and Christianization of that benighted, down-trodden portion

* "There are, probably, not less than two hundred thousand free blacks in the slave States. It is estimated, that these, by association render worse than useless an equal number of slaves. The aggregate value of these slaves, at an average estimate of four hundred dollars each, amounts to eighty millions of dollars. Thus are the people of the slave States injured by the existence of this refuse population in their midst, to an amount more than sufficient to colonize all the free blacks in the United States."

of the earth. The civilization of that people has baffled the energies of all modern missionary enterprises. Should the system of colonization, of which we speak, be the means of effecting this great work, this grand feature of the economy of Heaven, as it unquestionably will, all Christendom will be made to rejoice; the children who sat in darkness and in the shadow of death, will be forced to clap their hands for joy, that Africa ever contributed of her sons and her daughters to a system of even nominal servitude, the final result of which was the spread of Christianity, and the arts of civilized life throughout the whole length and breadth of her wide-spread but uncivilized domain. Its influence would tell largely upon the destinies of both races, and upon the prosperity, well-being, and perpetuity of our much-cherished republican institutions. It would settle this vexed question, and would allay the unhallowed excitement growing out of it, in a manner harmonizing with the glory of God, and the well-being of mankind.

The extinction of slavery has been the hobby of an unprincipled set of demagogues and fanatics, from time immemorial. Their narrow minds, and baser hearts, incapable of comprehending but the one idea, they have advocated that with a zeal and energy worthy of a good cause. To such an extreme have they carried their phrenzy and madness, as to materially affect the peace, harmony, and prosperity of our common country, and well nigh destroy our grand confederacy, by effecting a dissolution of the union of the States. Various names and forms, shapes and phases, has this germ of corruption, weakness, and folly assumed, without accomplishing

more than that of curtailing the wonted liberties of the slave, and riveting more securely the shackles of servitude.* Every movement which they have made has tended to perpetuate the institution, and to establish, beyond dispute, the fact, that the removal of the so called evil, can never be accomplished by any of the means to which *they* have ever resorted. Those, therefore, of our honest citizens, who really desire the removal of slavery, had better pause, reflect for a time, let reason usurp her dominion, and see whether there be not some other plan by which their much-desired object can be accomplished. Immediate abolition and elevation to citizenship and political equality, *never can* obtain. It is contrary to the order of nature, and inconsistent with the imperishable principles of justice and humanity. Nor has there ever been a system of gradual emancipation proposed, which would meet the exigencies of the case. That connecting colonization therewith, at a specified age, would lead to a perpetual separation of families, of husbands and wives, of parents and children, of which the annals of American slavery furnishes not a parallel, and which, in all its practical out-bearings, would lead to a state of things revolting to the feelings of every friend of humanity.

Every American citizen who owns property in slaves, holds that property by tenure of a right granted by the

* "Mr. Jno. L. Cary, in his pamphlet, entitled, *Slavery in America, Briefly Considered*, tells us, no doubt truly—'that the fanatical movement of the abolitionists checked the progress of things in Maryland; that the disposition manifested in Virginia, in 1832, to hasten the extinction of slavery, was suddenly checked by the same cause; so also in Kentucky.'"

founders of our government, the framers of the organic law of the nation. Our constitution, the *magna charta* of American liberty, the model political creed of the world, recognizes property in slaves, and was framed as much for the protection of him who holds *that* species of property, as for him whose wealth consists in lands, merchandise, or manufactures. The great fundamental principle which should constitute the basis of any and all governments, "That all men are created equal," was recognized by that memorable body, and incorporated into that constitution; and we, their posterity, recognize it as true to the letter, both in theory and practice. But we, like them, should not lose sight of the principle, that they were legislating for the Anglo-Saxon race alone, and not for a combination of races; for the American citizen, strictly speaking, and not for a motley variety of population, composed of an indiscriminate commixture of the civilized white man, the savage Indian, and the woolly-headed African negro. No such combination was ever contemplated by that honorable body, and any attempt on the part of the citizens of any State or territory, to form any such combination, or to elevate any other race to a political equality with the whites, we believe to come but little short of treason against the government. They may be permitted to dwell amongst us, and receive the protection of our government, but *never* to exercise the rights of citizenship.

The slaveholder, therefore, knowing that he holds his property in slaves by this right, and not ignorant of the fact, that the Bible recognizes the relation of master and slave; and that he, therefore, is violating no

principle of our holy religion, so long as he legitimately *uses*, and does not abuse the institution, will never suffer his neighbor, especially if he be a citizen of a free State,* to say to him, "Sir, your practices are in violation of the laws of both God and man; you must relinquish them, you must emancipate your slaves without 'the hope of fee or reward,' colonize them to Liberia, and then give them the necessary outfit for commencing life in their new sphere, or submit to their elevation to a political equality with yourself in our midst." Such a result never can obtain throughout the slave States; it is unreasonable to expect it, and the more it is agitated the longer will the institution of slavery be perpetuated. No motive of this kind can ever be brought to bear upon the slaveholder. The deep seated nature of his principles, the protection of his domestic rights, social privileges, and individual interests, will cause him to resist it as long as life lasts, or reason sits enthroned in his breast. But when the free negro—that curse of the slave and the slave owner, shall have been removed—when the natural increase of the white

* "Men are fond of berating their fellows for slaveholding, and waste their time, but very little of their money, (this they take better care of,) in making a loud outcry against a distant evil, while their gaze is so elevated as not to take in the yoke of slavery, which grinds men in the dust at their very feet; a heavier yoke than Roman, Turkish, or American slaveholding ever imposed. Every energy is bound down, every hope crushed, every affection forbidden, or made but an additional weight of pain and anguish; everything that life has of good or of beauty, is taken from them, and they are left, hopeless and despairing, to die miserably. If men would but expend a tithe of the sympathy on these slaves which they profess to have for the others, a jubilee would be kept in many a hovel." —*N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*

population shall have become so great as to render that species of labor cheaper and more desirable—in short, when he shall conceive it to be his *interest* to emancipate his slaves, and the general government stand ready to receive them at his hands, and remove them to a distant territory, where they may be comfortably provided for, and protected, *then* will he do it, and not before.

Let, then, the *free* black population of the United States, wheresoever dispersed, be removed by the direction and resources of the general government; and let it for ever after be a *standing proposition*, that all that may, at any future time, become free, shall be removed in the same manner. An insurmountable obstacle in the way of many who would emancipate their slaves from choice, were that *all* that would be required of them, were they not, by the laws of their several States, responsible ever afterwards for their support, would then be removed. Each circumstance of the kind would have its influence in its own immediate neighborhood. Others, seeing that a way was provided for their removal and colonization, in harmony with the interests of both master and slave, would follow the example; and thus would the work be commenced under more favorable auspices, based upon a firmer foundation, and with better assurances of success, than it ever has been commenced, or, we believe, ever can be upon any other plan. No other plan ever has succeeded, nor is there any prospect that it ever will.

Thus have we, as we humbly conceive, developed a plan which will, *in harmony with the best interests of both races*, when practically carried out, effectually

remove the entire free black population of the United States, and all that may hereafter become free, should it include the whole slave population and their natural increase. We trust our views are not altogether undeserving of a candid consideration; and that the fact of their not being of princely origin and stately birth, will not detract from their intrinsic value. We have proposed common ground, and a combination of effort in the removal of a common evil—a broad platform, where all sects and parties, without regard to local feeling or sectional interest, can meet and unite their efforts in the exercise of pure benevolence and true Christian charity. Could this state of things be carried out, we would hope, ere long, to witness a cessation of that unhallowed system of warfare which has so long ingloriously prevailed between the North and South, on the subject of slavery.

The Wilmot Proviso—that "vexed question," that high-born, dissevering principle of strife and contention, which was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity —that "double refined" element of Northern fanaticism, designed only for the pampered and vitiated palates of the dignified statesman and the fastidious aristocrat—that gilded hobby upon which broken down political hacks would fain regain "their lost estate," and ride into high stations—we hope ere long to see buried in the meshes of eternal oblivion. Incalculable are the evils which have already grown out of the unhallowed excitement, engendered by the untimely agitation of this question. It has acted as a firebrand, hurled into our national magazine of combustible political elements. Plucked from the "rectified" principles of the Garriso

nian school, the hot-bed of Northern fanaticism, it is but the transfer of the seeds of sedition and corruption from the humbler walks of the noisy rabble to the heart of our national legislature. It is no *new* principle, but an old tenet of a corrupt faction—a recognized element of a false political creed, under a new name and garb, and in a new sphere of action. Take any other tenet of that faction, or element of that political creed, and transplant it into a soil and climate as well adapted to its development, and watered by *golden* showers as congenial to its growth, the expansive elements of its nature will be exhibited in the same proportion. It requires no extraordinary powers of discernment to discover, that every principle involved in this issue is founded in error, and unwarranted by truth and justice. It is certainly a political paradox, without a parallel or precedent, that a government should, in the frame-work of her organic law, ordain a species of property, forbid any interference with the rights of private individuals, and subsequently, through her legal representatives in Congress assembled, enact laws especially interfering with those rights, by restricting the holders of said property to certain specified States and sections of our common country. Such a proposition is absurd, and inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our government. And we are confident, that no intelligent legislator, who did not wish to make political capital with the multitude, regardless of the imperishable principles of truth and justice, would for a moment contend for such a principle. This question, we repeat, has been productive of incalculable evil; and we hope soon to see it, with all the various elements

of false philanthropy—those empty fabrications of a dream—which have grown out of this unhallowed excitement on the subject of slavery, buried in oblivion.

When this is done, and reason shall have assumed her dominion; when the system we have proposed, or some other of a kindred character, shall have been established, and each State be left to the free exercise of her legitimate rights, and the regulation of her own domestic policy and institutions; then will peace and prosperity again smile upon our common country. And as the tide of emigration and civilization shall continue to roll onward, like the mighty current of the majestic father of waters, State after State will rise up, tier upon tier, and knock for admission into the Union, until our whole vast territory, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the great lakes to the golden city of the Montezumas, shall become densely populated, and present a mighty phalanx—one undivided confederacy of free and independent sovereignties—the most powerful, chivalrous, patriotic, and enlightened Christian nation on the earth. A result which every Christian patriot and philanthropist *must* desire from his inmost soul.

Not wishing to be considered as reckoning without our "host," upon the great and all-absorbing question of slavery, which is generally admitted to have become the most important question of the age, we subjoin the following extracts, from the pens of Rev. A. CAMPBELL, of Bethany College, Va.; and Rev. GEO. JUNKIN, of Miami University, Ohio: two of the ablest divines of the age in which they live.

SLAVERY AND THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

[From Rev. A. Campbell.]

THIS subject is engrossing much attention, and calling forth much inquiry in every direction. It is, with many humane persons, of no religious profession, and with professors of all parties, a very exciting subject. It is being pressed on my attention by many correspondents, and I am frequently called upon to open my pages to a full discussion of the subject, or to give my opinion on the whole premises. I, therefore, conceive it to be a duty which I owe to myself, my Christian brethren, and my fellow-citizens at large, to deliver myself fully upon the subject, so far as the Bible arguments, *pro* and *con*, are alledged by both parties, and, once for all, place the subject upon our pages.

With us, the Bible is the only infallible standard, both of religion and humanity. The God of the Bible is the Lawgiver of the Universe, and he has, by his inspired and commissioned teachers, fully revealed his will touching all the duties arising from all the relations in which man stands to man, in the church and in the world.

God is the author of all human relations. He has created the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, magistrate and subject. He has also prescribed the duties of husbands and wives, of parents and children, of masters and servants, of governors and governed, towards each other. Our moral righteousness, as well as our piety, is to be approved or condemned by his statutes and precepts.

There is false religion, as well as true religion, in the world. There is also false, as well as true humanity. There is a healthful, as well as a morbid sensitiveness, on almost every question which may be mooted, on human relations and obligations. Moderation, candor, and charity, are, therefore, always in good keeping with our position, when any one of these grand subjects is agitated with unusual earnestness and zeal. I, therefore, with all deference to the opinions of others, will attempt to express my own, on the subjects now pressed and pressing upon our attention.

The idea of master and servant, is as old as the Bible, and has existed since the days of Cain and Abel. It was said to Cain, being the first-born of mankind, that if he did well, "he should rule over his brother" Abel, and unto him his brother would look up. The younger shall serve the elder, is one of the most natural and ancient oracles in the world. It was said by the inspired Noah, that Canaan should be a servant to his brethren. From this, I only argue, that the idea of servitude is coeval with society, antediluvian and postdiluvian.

Two thousand years before the Christian era, the patriarchs were generally masters, and some of them great masters, over their fellow-men. Was it voluntary or involuntary, is not now the question. There was a necessity, in the very essence of society, for this relation. Orphans, and unfortunate persons, must be served, and they must serve in return. Such was, and is, and always will be, the irremediable condition of mankind.

It is of the essence of benevolence, that widows, orphans, and the destitute, be provided for; and it is of the essence of justice, that, when practicable, they should voluntarily, or involuntarily, serve in return. But these are only suggestions or reflections, growing

out of the nature of society. The divine law is promulged in harmony with this condition of society, and based upon the recognition of it. And to this, we especially invite attention.

There is but one divine and absolutely perfect code of social duties; one absolutely perfect constitution of society in the world. The civilized world, without an exception, without a dissenting voice, assents to this law as the standard of moral perfection in the social system. It was written, and it is the only law ever literally written, by the hand of God. I need not say, that it was the *magna charta* of the only nation ever God placed under a theocratic form of government. It is, sometimes, emphatically called, *the Law*, or "the law of ten commandments." Its preamble is, "I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt—out of the house of *bondage*." "Therefore, hear, O Israel!"

To one section of it, we emphatically invite attention. It is the consummating statute of the divine constitution: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, *nor his man servant, nor his maid servant*, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's" *property*. This is our first argument in demonstration of the divine recognition and acknowledgment of the relation of master and servant, or of one man having a rightful property in another. It is, therefore, all-important, that we understand the meaning of the word *servant*, as used by the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge of the world, in this case. That a man is here as fully recognized as property as a house, an ox, an ass, is indisputable. The term selected is as fully defined as any other term in the precept—as the term *wife*, and the term *house*. This, to some minds, may demand a word of explanation.

Suffice it, then, to state, that there is, in the Hebrew language, as there was in Hebrew society, two classes of servants, represented by two distinct words, indicative of different positions, or relations. These are, *hired servants* and *bondmen*. The former is represented by one word, and the latter by another. These are of different origin and meaning.

A *hired servant*, in the law of Moses, is called *sacheer;* a bondman, or bondservant, is uniformly denominated *gehved*. The latter is never called *sacheer*, nor the former *gehved*. Like *doulos*, in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament, *gehved* includes divers sorts of servants not receiving wages; but *sacheer* indicates simply a hired servant.

They are sometimes found in the same verse, in contrast. Leviticus xxv. 39: "If thy brother that dwelleth by thee, becomes poor, and be sold to thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as (a *gehved*) a *bond*servant, but as (a *sacheer*) a *hired* servant." Again, verse 42: "He shall not be sold as (a *gehved*) a bondman;" verse 44: "Of the heathen thou shalt" (or mayest) "buy boudmen," (*gehved.*)

Again: Leviticus xxv. 53: "As a yearly hired servant, (a *sacheer*) he shall be with thee." So, again, in Deuteronomy xv. 18: "He hath been worth double a hired servant;" xxiv. 14: "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant." In both these cases, it is *sacheer*. But when Moses says, (Deut. xv. 15,) "Remember thou wast a bondman in Egypt," he does not say thou wast a *sacheer*, but a *gehved;* not a *hired* servant, but a slave.

This, I give in evidence; and much more, to the same effect, could be given in evidence, to show that the tenth precept of *the law* of ten commandments—the standard of moral perfection, universally so acknowledged—

recognized and sanctioned the idea of servitude, absolute and unlimited in duration, by not using the word *sacheer*, but the word *gehved*—the same word used in the malediction against Canaan: "A servant of servants," or a *gehved gehvedim*, "shall he be to his brethren." This, then, I assume, to be a settled point. Its value is hereafter to be considered.

In the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the contrast between the bond and the hired servant, is kept up by the terms *oiketees* and *misthootos*. The former, as well as *doulos*, being originally applied to bondservants, and the latter to hired servants. The *oiketees* was one that belonged to the house, or family; the *misthootos* was one that served for wages, whether the period was long or short: the other served as a bondman, and had the privileges of the family protection and support.

It is worthy of remark, in this place, that the term *servant*, in our language, when applied to apostles, prophets, or workers for Christ, is never *misthotos*, because they are not *hirelings*, or free servants: they were the Lord's bondmen, and are, therefore, called *douloi*, or *oixetai*. They held no property in themselves; they were, while free in one sense, the Lord's bondmen in another. But we return to the moral law and Jewish dispensation, for Biblical and rudimental ideas of the subject of servitude.

The last precept of the decalogue, and the first precept of the judicial or political code, must be compared, in order to decide the proper interpretation of both. We shall, therefore, place them in juxtaposition, side by side, that they may reciprocally define and illustrate one another. They read as follows: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his

ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's." Ex. xxi. 2. "If thou buy a Hebrew servant (*gehved*), six years shall he serve, and in the seventh he shall go out free, for nothing. If he come in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons and daughters, the wife and children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free, then his master shall bring him to the magistrates; he shall also bring him to the door, or to the door post, and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him for ever."

Here, then, commences the institution of servitude among the Jews, under a theocracy. I need not say that the sun gives light. As little need to say, that the law of servitude was "holy, just, and good." This is Hebrew servitude, and neither Greek nor Roman, neither Anglican nor American slavery. The Hebrew servant, here rendered by the SEVENTY, into Greek, by *paida* (from *pais*, a boy) was, likely, a young man. Being, it is presumed, a minor, he is sold for six years. Meantime, he falls in love with one of his master's female servants, and is constitutionally married, while yet a *gehved*—a bond servant. The day of his freedom arrives! What a dilemma! He has a wife, and children; his by *nature*, and his master's by *right*—by a *jure divino*. Which shall he choose—freedom or slavery?

A modern abolitionist would say, "Run away, my good sir, and take your dear wife and children with you. God has made all men free and equal. Your master took the advantage of you, and now, heartless tyrant that he is, he will keep your wife, and your dear babes, in

perpetual slavery, which, I am sure, you love as much as he loves his. There is no moral wrong in this. You were not of mature age and reason when you got married, as very few such slaves as you are. Take up your couch, sir, and walk. You are getting no wages here: you will be a slave all your days. Can you have your ears bored to the door post, and carry to your grave the brand of your cowardice and infamy? Will you make yourself a slave for ever? If *bored*, your doom is fixed."

His master having treated him with all humanity, being one that feared God, and wrought righteousness, he thanked his new friend for his benevolence, and said, "I cannot leave my wife; she was given me by her master, and he has done well for her, for me, and for our children. I cannot leave him—I cannot leave them." His ear was bored with as little pain as a lady suffers for the admission of a golden ring, and he and his offspring became servants "for ever."

Such was the first statute of the political code of the commonwealth of Israel, enacted *Anno Mundi* 2513; before Christ, 1492. And such is the first commentary on the tenth commandment—the first law of the new constitution, under which God placed the elect nation of Israel.

Such will be called the bright side of the picture. There is, however, no picture of one color: that is physically and morally impossible. Nor is there any picture without shade. And such is the present picture of all society—the best that exists on earth.

It will be said, and said with truth, that this is a case of voluntary servitude. But only as I have presented it. It is, indeed, a choice of evils.

Suppose this said slave had been married the first year after his master bought him, to a young female servant,

the property of his master, and that he was a forward, energetic, independent, and noble-minded slave. What then? He asks his wife and children at the commencement of the Sabbatical year. His master refuses to give him his wife and children. Too hard, indeed—tyrannical, cruel! Is it not? Yes, say A., B. and C. But, responds his master, his wife was mine, and I cannot part with her. Her mistress loves her, and cannot do without her. I cannot afford it. His labor has not countervailed my expenditures upon him and her, and their children. I do no wrong, either on the score of humanity or of justice. God enacted the law. He made me master, and him my bondservant. I can do better for him and them, than they can do for themselves, and serve myself, too, better than without them. We are all happier together than we could be apart. I am the slave, he the freeman. I have to care for him; he has no care for himself, his wife, or children. If he were able to compensate me, I might give him his wife and his children; and if he chooses to do so, he will sooner obtain the means under my direction, and by my capital, than he could otherwise do. It is a benevolent and a just law, and I will abide by it. Such was the first law of the kingdom of Israel, under the theocracy, and such would be a rational and moral view of it. Other statutes on this subject, found in that law, will prepare our minds for the consideration and comprehension of the Christian law, the higher law, and the Fugitive Slave Law of the present crisis.

But it is neither my duty nor my inclination to defend it. It is enough to say, that it was God's own enactment, as much as the law of ten commands, but it is not of the same compass nor perpetuity. It was a local and temporary arrangement. Its value to us consists, chiefly, in the recognition of what may, in the judgment of God, be

consistent with moral rectitude and the purity of the divine law. The God of the New Testament is the God of the Old. It is a maxim, universally conceded, that, "what is just in little, is just in much." That which may be done rightfully for a day, a month, or a year, may be done for a longer period. It is theft to steal one cent, as essentially theft, as to steal ten thousand dollars. A person who can rightfully hold property in a man for one year, or five, may rightfully extend the term indefinitely. Christianity is not more just than Judaism. But it is yet premature, to apply the principle developed in this statute, as it would be to defend it, being a divine enactment. We have the whole Bible open, law and gospel, too.

We greatly respect an intelligent, conscientious, and generous philanthropy. We will ever do homage to a pure philanthropist. But there may be a morbid, sickly philanthropy, as well as a rational, and sound philanthropy. The religious sometimes become superstitious: the generous are not always just. And professed philanthropists have, not unfrequently, been more fanatical than benevolent, and more in love with their own opinions than with the rights of man.

But, with the patient and generous charities of my readers, I will endeavor to develop the Christian duties and obligations on the whole premises, now being laid before the public, on the higher law, the Fugitive Slave Law, and every other law allied to the present question—the great question of the age, so far as our national interests and honor are concerned. A. C.

PROPOSITION.

[From Rev. George Junkin.]

The Hebrews were permitted, by their law, to buy servants from the heathen; to hold them in perpetual servitude; and to transmit them as hereditary property to their children.

This is a compound proposition, and may be broken down into three distinct parts.

1. They were permitted to buy servants, male and female, from the heathen. Exod. xii. 44,—"Every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof." This is decisive as to men servants.

Second proof. Lev. xxv. 44–46, "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of [from, in Hebrew] the heathen that are round about you, of [from] them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of [from] the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall you buy, and of their families, that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen *for ever:* but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor." This passage is most conclusive as to the first subdivision. It also meets the second, viz: that the servitude is *perpetual*, "they shall be your bondmen *for ever—Le Olaum.*" And it is equally pertinent to the third. They

could transmit these slaves, as hereditary property, to their children. But, here, note particular: 1. They are *property*, "possession." It is the same Hebrew word, as that used in v. 41, to describe the landed estates to which the Israelites returned at the Jubilee, "and unto the *possession* of his fathers shall he return." It is the same used to describe the Redeemer's right in his redeemed people. Psalm ii. 8, "I shall give * * * the uttermost parts of the earth for thy *possession*." It is the same used to describe Abraham's interest in the field of Ephon and the cave of Machpelah, after he paid for them, when "the field and the cave that is therein were made sure unto Abraham, for a *possession* of a burying place, by the sons of Heth." In short, this word is invariably used, to signify ownership in landed estate—not *transitory* but *permanent* possession. Let men, therefore, criticise as their fancy directs, as to men and women being viewed and treated as property; God's word says, unequivocally, "they shall be your *possession*."

But, it will be said, this is horrible! Human beings bought as *property*, and held as a possession permanent! Well, abhor it, then, if it is horrible. But, there it is on the sacred page. I have not asserted it, it is God's assertion. I have not said it is *right*. Neither, as I suppose, has God affirmed it to be *right*. All I affirm is, that God's law *permitted* it to Israel. If you cannot endure it, with God be your controversy; and at his word be yet more horrified. For, 2. This *possession* is *perpetual—Le Olaum, for ever* shall they be your bondmen. It is a bondage durable as the life of the parties. Yea, more horrible still! 3. At the death of the master who bought the slaves, they do not go out free—they pass down as an inheritance to his

children: they stand in all the legal relations of real estate. As such, the terms of the law speak of them. It is the same word as is used, Num. xxxiii. 54, "Ye shall divide the land by lot for an *inheritance*," etc. And xxxiv. 13, "This is the land which ye shall *inherit* by lot." And Abraham inquires, "How shall I know that I shall *inherit* it?"

Such is the condition of heathen slaves under the Mosaic Law. Most unhappy men! Awful state of degradation! Hopeless bondage to them and to their children after them!

But, now, is it not obvious, that the dreadfulness of their state depends very much upon incidental circumstances? Suppose they fall into the hands of "believing masters," such as Paul speaks of, who will be kind to them, and teach them the way of salvation through the Messiah, what is there so fearful in their condition? Look what Isaiah says, ch. xiv. 2, concerning heathen people: "And the people, [of God] shall take them and bring them to their place; and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and maidens." Assuredly, when the grace of God touches the hearts of these slaves, and they become God's freedmen, their condition is infinitely better than that of their brethren according to the flesh, who are afar off from God, and free in a physical sense. "I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in tents of wickedness."

PROPOSITION.

[From Rev. George Junkin.]

That God has nowhere, in the Old Testament, PROHIBITED *slavery. There is no command to this amount, "Masters, let your servants go free." The relation of master and slave is nowhere condemned as a sin and forbidden to exist.*

The position here taken, is expressed in three forms, to prevent, if possible, all misapprehension. If any man affirm the opposite, let him adduce the proof. If the relation of master and servant, in perpetuity or for life, be, in itself, and apart from all cruelties and abuses of power, a horrible sin in the sight of God, let us have the text from the Old Testament to condemn it.

Permit me, here, to throw out a caveate against misconstruction and misrepresentation. Although it is not our business, more than our opponents, to justify the ways of God to men, yet, I remark, God has nowhere *sanctioned* slavery. To *sanction*, is to approve of and command as a thing that is right, and that ought to be. Except in cases of forfeiture of liberty, God has not commanded—has not made it obligatory upon man, to reduce his fellow to involuntary bondage. On the contrary, I take the distinction before alluded to, that the Bible *tolerates* slavery. Now, *toleration* is *bearing with—enduring* a thing; and it implies, that the thing is viewed as an evil. Job *tolerated* his boils, and the foolish behaviour of his wife. We *tolerate* evils that cannot be instantly removed. All wearisome labor, of

body or of mind, is an evil. All petulant, peevish, and vexatious conduct, is an evil. The perpetual harrassment to which this Synod has been exposed, from year to year, by the Anti-Slavery party, is an evil, hard to be endured; yet the majority of Synod have *tolerated* it—you have fought against it, as Napoleon said of the Russians at the battle of Smolensk, "with passive bravery."

But I hear our *tolerated* brethren say, how long must this evil of slavery be *tolerated?* Are we never to see the end of it? Must all the light of the New Dispensation be spent in vain? Cannot this dark spot be illuminated by it? Will you plead for its everlasting *toleration.*

Be patient, Brethren! God has tolerated this dreadful evil more than thirty centuries of years. And he has tolerated yet worse evils. He has tolerated you and us, with all our sins and corruptions upon us; with all our unkind speeches, and hard sayings, and heart burnings, and jealousies, and anger, and wrath, and murmurings against God. He has borne with us in our censures upon his Word and his providence, for this very spirit of tolerance, to which we are indebted for an existence out of hell. Why does he not instantly cut off all evil from the earth; either by cutting us off, or by making us instantly and perfectly holy? "Nay! but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"

Be patient, Brethren, with me, and with God. Let us proceed to the New Testament. What are its teachings on the subject of slavery? If slavery be the master sin of our world; if all other evils sink into insignificance, in comparison of this giant crime; if this fearful and desolating sin—this soul-damning sin, as brethren in this Synod deem it, abounded under the

Old Testament, surely the remedying of it will form a prominent feature of the New Economy. Surely, when the Redeemer comes to cleanse the sanctuary, and to purify the altar, which have, since the days of Gibeon's enslavement, been polluted by slave labor, he will, at least, drive away all slave labor from the temple and the altar. He will speak a plain and unequivocal language. He will make it to be clearly known, that slavery is no longer to be tolerated in the Church of God. If Jesus be an abolitionist, in the modern sense, surely his new revelation will for ever wash out the foul stain of slavery. Mr. Moderator, what think you? If our opposing brethren had written the New Testament, or any one book of it, would you not expect to find a strong, and plain, and unequivocal testimony against slavery, in it?

But now, sir, on the contrary, I fearlessly affirm, that there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which, either expressly, in so many words, or by fair and just construction, forbids slavery. To avoid misconception, let me divide this compound proposition. I then declare:

I. That there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which expressly forbids the having and the holding of a slave.

II. That there is not a sentence in the New Testament, which, by fair and just interpretation, according to the rules of grammar, gives ground for the logical inference, that the simple holding of a slave, or slaves, is inconsistent with Christian profession and Christian character.

The proof of the affirmative lies on the affirmant; let the man, who elects himself to controvert either of

these, present his *proof*. But, lest none should be forthcoming, let us see how near an approximation may be made toward establishing these propositions in this negative form. Should any person affirm, that between the hours of six A. M. and six P. M. on the 19th of September, 1843, the present speaker had kidnapped a slave off a steamer lying at the quay in Cincinnati, I could prove a negative by proving an *alibi*—by proving my continual presence, during that period of time, in this or the adjoining village. Let us look into the New Testament for abolitionism, and see how far an *alibi* can be supported.

1. *My first subordinate proposition here, is, that the Greek word*, doulos, *usually translated servant, properly and commonly means a person held to service for life—a slave.*

This word occurs, according to Schmidius, about one hundred and twenty-five times in the New Testament. Of these, omitting the parallel places in the last three Gospels, the following is a general classification, viz:—

1.	It is applied to servants of God and of Christ, - - - - - - - -	34 times.
2.	To servants of men, such as the householder and the owner of the vineyard,	34 "
3.	To the king who made the supper, and to him who took account of his servants, - - - - - - - -	10 "
4.	To servants of sin and Satan, - -	6 "
5.	To the servant of the centurion, Matt. viii. 5, - - - - - - - -	1 "
6.	To Christians, as servants to each other, Matt. xx. 27, - - - - - -	1 "

7.	To Christ, as God's servant, Phil. ii. 7	1 times.
8.	To Judaizing Christians, Gal. iv. 7,	1 "
	In all, - - - - - - -	88 "

leaving about 37 as parallels.

Let as now see, whether, in all these, the idea of continuous, perpetual servitude be not included.

The first class—the servants of God and of his Christ—are life servants; bound under the most absolute authority to honor and obey and submit to his commands. They profess so to be. They have come near to the door-post, and their ears have been pierced through with the arrows of his conviction, and they are his *for ever*. Moreover, they were *unwilling*, when he bought them with a price, and they were unwilling until he changed them by his law, and made them "both to will and to do of his own good pleasure." They are servants for ever, "under the yoke,"—"take my yoke upon you."

Passing the second class, as the one in controversy, we notice the third, Matt. xviii. 23, &c., and xxii. 3, &c. The master, in the former, like many in our day, had entrusted much of his property to his servants, to be employed for his advantage; and thus, one of them was found to have acted very unfaithfully—he had squandered his lord's money. His master, just as masters now do, commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children. Now, if *doulos* does not express the relation of slavery—if it mean here a *hired servant*, how can we understand the transaction? Where is the law to sell a hired servant? And, if it be said, he was sold under the law, which makes indebtedness a crime, rendering the debtor obnoxious to sale, then we have slavery recognized. Take it either way, then, you have the relation of perpetual servitude.

The evidence is equally plain, that the servants of the king, in waiting upon the marriage supper, were not hirelings, but perpetual servants. And here we may observe, as was remarked of the Hebrew terms, the Greek word *misthotos*, means a hired person, one employed to work for wages, for a period long or short, as the contract may be: such was the kind of service performed on Zebedee's fishing boat. James and John "left their father, Zebedee, in the ship, with the *hired servants*." And the Saviour speaks of this kind of labor as not so reputable and trustworthy as the *doulos;* John x. 12, 13: "But he that is a *hireling*, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth. The hireling, *misthotos*, fleeth because he is an *hireling*, and careth not for the sheep." It would seem that the *doulos*, the permanent servant, was the more trustworthy. Accordingly, it is universally agreed, that the servants in the parable of the supper, represent the gospel ministers—permanent officers in Christ's house, who would, therefore, be very unsuitably represented by the relation of a hireling, a temporary servant, working for wages. Besides, the kind of service at this feast, is just such as slaves, or permanent servants are usually employed at. Farther, the invited guests killed some o the servants, which it is not conceivable they would have done, had they been hired persons. These things, in connection with the fact, that the historian does not use *misthotos*—a word uniformly applied to the temporary relation of a hired person, as faithfulness to historical verity required, if the relation had been temporary—these, I say, must convince the candid, that *doulos* means the permanent relation of a life servant.

The fourth class relates to slaves of sin and of Satan, John viii. 34: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever

committeth sin is the *servant, doulos,* of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house [the family apartment] for ever: but the son abideth ever. If, then, the Son make you free, ye are free indeed." Here the *doulos* is contradistinguished from the son, and also from the free person. So, Rom. vi. 17, "God be thanked, that ye were the *servants, doulos,* of sin." And, 2 Pet. ii. 19, "While they promise them liberty, they, themselves, are the servants, *douloi,* of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage;"—he is made a *doulos.* Here, again, servant is contrasted with free. Besides, there is express reference to the ancient and universal custom of holding and accounting prisoners of war as slaves. Men are taken captive by the devil, and are the servants of their captor. We need not here dwell, to show that it is a base bondage under which men are held, to sin and Satan, and that it is without limit in itself—it is designed by the master, and assented to by the slave, that he shall serve for ever; and so it will prove in every case where our Redeemer does not interfore, and deliver, by his almighty power, the poor slave from his cruel and yet voluntary bondage.

Case fifth, is that of the *doulos* of the Roman centurion or captain. That slavery prevailed all over the Roman Empire at this time, and that it was a most absolute and degraded slavery, wherein the master had the power of life and death at his own option, will not be controverted by any, whose reputation for scholarship entitles them to any notice at all. We cannot, surely, be expected to prove that the captain's servant was a slave. For a man to assert the contrary, places him *hors du combat.*

Case sixth, relates to the services required from one Christian to another, and they are undoubtedly permanent, and of perpetual obligation.

So the seventh, an insulated instance, describes the relation of Christ to God the Father. That it is permanent, and for life, is obvious, and involves absolute submission in all things.

The other insulated case is, that of the judaizing Christian, Gal. iv. 7, who makes the ceremonial law a yoke of bondage, and himself a slave to it.

Thus, if there is any exception to the absoluteness and permanency of the obligation, and the servitude, expressed by this term, *doulos*, it must be found in the second class; all the others imply entire subjection, and that without limit, as long as the related parties exist.

The servants of the householder, who had sowed good seed in his field, and of the man who delivered his talents for improvement, are so similar to the case of the marriage supper, that the same reflections are mainly applicable to these. So, also, of the owner of the vineyard, Matt. xxi. 35, &c. The only other case in the Gospels, that of the priest's servant, whose ear was cut off, may easily be understood, by reference to the laws already cited, permitting the priests to buy servants: the others, it is not my intention to go over, in the detail.

It would be tedious, and would lead to the conviction, that, without one exception, in all the contexts, the idea of absolute and permanent bondage to service, would be found to harmonize best, with the drift and meaning of the passages respectively. Persuaded I am, the case never will be made out, where *doulos*, necessarily means a temporary servitude, at the option of the servant. Many of the remaining passages, will, however, come up in other connections. Meanwhile, I rest in the belief, that the great mass of unprejudiced minds, must admit, that *doulos* properly means a *slave*.

Let us, however, make this clear to a demonstration, by the argument from contrast. If we find two words, used in opposition to each other, the meaning of one being ascertained, will forcibly illustrate that of the other. Now, *freeman* and *slave* are such terms—they express opposite ideas. He who is free, cannot, at the same time, and in the same respect, manner, and sense, be a slave. In different senses, such opposite terms may agree. A man may be a slave to tobacco and whisky, and yet a freeman, in a civil sense. Still, freedom and slavery are opposites; and if I shew that to be free means a state wherein a man is under no obligation to work or labor for another—the other has no power or claim over him, so as to compel him to work; and if I shew that this state is contrasted to another, as its opposite, then that other is a state of slavery and bondage.

Here let me refer to the cases already cited, for another purpose: John viii. 34, "He that committeth sin, is the *doulos* or servant of sin; but if the Son make him free, then he is *free* indeed." Here, *doulos* and *eleutheros*—a slave and a free man—are contrasted. Again, in Rom. vi. 17, "Ye were the *douloi*, servants of sin; but being made *free;*" here is the same contrast. So also, 2 Pet. ii. 19, "While they promise them liberty, *eleutheria*, they themselves are the *douloi*, slaves of corruption." 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22, "Art thou called, being a servant, *doulos*, care not for it: but if thou mayest be made *free*, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, *doulos*, is the Lord's freeman—rather freed man—*apeleutheros;* likewise, also, he that is called, being free, *eleutheros*, is Christ's servant, *doulos*." Here, the contrast is plain and direct, and three times repeated. 1 Cor. xii. 13, "Whether we be Jews or

Gentiles; whether we be bond or free, *douloi* or *eleutheroi;*" Gal. iii. 28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, *doulos* nor *eleutheros;*" Col. iii. 11, "There is neither bond nor free, *doulos* nor *eleutheros;*" Rev. vi. 15, "And every bondman and every freeman: every *doulos* and every *eleutheros;*" Rev. xiii. 16, "And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, *eleutherous* and *doulous.*" Rev. xix. 18, "And the flesh of all men, both free and bond, *eleutheroi* and *douloi,* both small and great."

Thus, by an accumulation of evidence, even to weariness, it is demonstrated, that *doulos* means a slave, as certainly as *eleutheros* means a freeman. Here are twelve distinct and unequivocal instances of contrast. I take it, then, as most conclusively proved, that *doulos* properly means a slave—a person under absolute authority for life, to a master.

2. *The second subordinate proposition with an inference, is, that Paul advises servants to abide quietly in their condition. This he could not do if the relation of master and slave was, in itself, a sin.*

1 Cor. vii. 20–24, "Let every man abide in the same calling, wherein he was called. Art thou," &c., as above. "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men. Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God."

Here, note, 1. This is a spiritual call—that inward vocation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a man is made to hear and to obey the Gospel, in a spiritual sense. He who is thus called, is a converted man. But there is a modified sense, in which the word is used to signify a man's employment—his state and condition in this world's affairs. And the Apostle indulges a play upon this sense.

In verse 17, he settles the principle: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, *so let him walk*. And so ordain I in all the churches." The gospel does not come to break up the social relations. If a hired girl is converted, it does not hence follow, that she must sit at the table, and her employer take turns with her in the house-work, and table-waiting. Paul was not a leveler in this respect. But, let every one pursue his business honestly. "Is any man called, being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called, being uncircumcised? let him not be circumcised." These outward circumstances are trifles. What a man's business is—what his condition in life, is a small matter, if only he has the spiritual vocation. 2. Among the called, at Corinth, were found some servants—*doulous*—slaves. Then sprang up the question: If I am called into the service of Jesus Christ, can I any longer be obedient to an earthly master? Can a man serve two masters? If I have taken Christ's yoke upon me, how can I be, and continue, a *doulos* to my old master who bought me? Now, it is easy to see, that if Paul had preached abolitionism, there would have been directly a slave insurrection at Corinth. If he had decided, that conversion to Christianity nullified the master's right to control his slave, and made him free, it would have brought Christianity into direct collision with the civil and domestic relations of the whole Roman world. But Paul was no abolitionist: he would not interfere, in the least, with the master's authority. He had, a little above, decided in favor of another social relation. Marriage, though consummated in a pagan state, he says, is binding, even after one of the parties has been converted to Christianity. The question had been raised, Can I be the spouse of Christ, and also of a pagan husband at the

same time? Certainly, says Paul, the one is spiritual, the other a natural—moral relation: "Let not the wife depart from her husband:" so, here, let not the servant depart from his master. This is the third remark: The relation is not to be renounced—"Let every man wherein he is called, therein abide." If he is a *doulos*, let him remain contented: he can be a slave in regard to temporal things; and, yet, a freeman in regard to spiritual things. There is no necessary collision between the claims of the two masters. If your earthly master acts uprightly, he will never require you to do an act forbidden by your heavenly master. But should such case occur, why, then obey God, and suffer whatever punishment man chooses to inflict. 4. Manumission was often practised in the Roman and Grecian world. Paul advises the servant, if his master offer to manumit him, to accept his freedom with gratitude—"use it rather." When grace touched the master's heart, and especially if his conversion, as doubtless was often the case, was brought about by the patient and quiet obedience, and manifest improvement of his converted slaves, it cannot be doubted, he often freed his servants: and this is God's plan of abolition. A person who, in the phrase, "use it rather," can find a warrant for a slave insurrection—for robbery, theft, and murder, gives melancholy evidence, that he himself is the slave of his own pride and wicked passions. 5. Paul points out the method of the spiritual freedom—it was by purchase: "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men." Most violently and blindly has this passage been abused, to the encouragement of slave insurrections; "be not ye the servants of men"—this, we, Mr. Moderator, have heard the subject of song here; contrary to the obvious, plain meaning of the whole context. It has been time after time harped upon, as

evidence, that slaves are forbidden to serve men; whereas, the whole drift of the context enjoins submission. "Ye are bought with a price." Now, in what sense? Is it not undeniable, that the price here is Christ's blood? And must it not follow that the servitude into which this spiritual purchase brings them, is a spiritual servitude? Do they not take Christ's yoke on them? And yet, these brethren insist on it, that "be not ye the servants of men," is a natural servitude! "Don't obey your masters according to the flesh; resist them, they have no right to command you, and you do wrong in obeying; 'be not ye the servants of men.'" Did you ever hear of such horrible perversion? Can this be the true meaning, when other passages, so numerous, command the very contrary? "Servants obey your masters." We must say, such a construction is not only violent, but it is disingenuous; and no man could, for a moment, allow himself in it, but that the heat of excitement, and the warmth of controversy, blinds the mind, and hurries the zealot over all rules of reason and of right. No commentator ever entertained such an idea: until modern abolitionism invented it, the world, I presume, was ignorant of such a construction. But it is a fair sample of the logic of excited feeling. Paul urges the *doulos* to abide content in his condition; because, though a servant of man, he is Christ's freed man—a spiritual freeman, but a slave civilly. But he must not abide the *doulos* of man, say these brethren—must not be civilly a slave; because he has been spiritually bought with a price. The apostle may contradict himself, but he must not teach the duty of servants to obey their own masters! When he says, "Be not ye the *douloi* of men," he must not mean *spiritually*, but naturally!!

3. *The third subordinate proposition, with an inference.—The New Testament recognizes some masters as good men—true and faithful believers: therefore, the relation of master and slave may exist, consistently with Christian character and profession.*

Proof 1.—Matt. viii. 9, 10; "The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant, *doulos*, shall be healed. When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Here is a slaveholder whose faith stands above suspicion. But we have been told that every man who is guilty of slaveholding, if he die without repenting of this sin, will go to hell! How differently the Saviour and some of his disciples judge!

Proof II.—By Eph. i. 1, we learn, that the epistle is addressed "to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." And by vi. 9, we learn, that among these faithful brethren are masters: "And ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master, [Christ] also, is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him. Finally, my brethren," &c. Thus slaveholders are recognized as faithful believers; and no order is given to cease to be slaveholders.

Proof III.—1 Tim. vi. 2; "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." Here the slaves, *douloi*, are commanded to submit, because their masters are believers—faithful and beloved brethren, partakers of the grace of our Lord.

PROOF IV.—Philemon 5; Paul, addressing this slaveholder, says he had heard "of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints."

So we might cite all the cases where masters are commanded to do their duties; for they are, in every instance, addressed as *Christian* masters; and the same is true of the slaves. Clearly, then, the inference follows, that this relation is not inconsistent with Christian character and profession.

4. *The fourth subordinate proposition.—The New Testament recognizes the existence of slavery.*

5. *The fifth subordinate proposition.—The New Testament prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and of masters to their servants; enjoining obedience to the one, and kind treatment from the other.*

MEANWHILE, no injunction is laid upon masters to liberate their slaves; nor is there any hint given to slaves to run away from their masters. All this I shall prove by plain and direct Scriptures, and then shall deduce some legitimate conclusions.

PROOF I.—Titus ii. 9, 10; "Exhort servants, *doulous*, to be obedient unto their own masters, *despotais*, and to please them well in all things; not answering again, not purloining, [stealing] but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things."

It is important to remark, that this, and most of the subsequent proofs, are found in the midst of contexts where the leading social relations of life are dwelt upon, and their duties pointed out. Here "the aged men," and "the aged women; "the young women," and "young men," are exhorted. In some of the following cases,

husbands and wives, parents and children, magistrates and subjects, are mentioned; and, just among them, servants and masters, recognizing it as an existing relation.

On this passage, note, 1. The servants, *doulous*, are exhorted to be obedient to their own masters, *despotais*, *despots*, *absolute masters*. It is the strongest term the Greek language knows to express absolute and arbitrary power.

2. That this obedience should be cheerful and hearty, not with an ill grace, a surly, and dissatisfied, and hesitating manner.

3. They are commanded not to steal their master's property; but to feel an interest in his welfare, and to be faithful in looking after it.

How different, in all three respects, this, from the teachings of modern anti-slavery doctors! They teach that slaves may, and ought to disobey their masters—to run off, to steal their master's, or any person's horse, saddle, bridle, food, clothing, anything that may be necessary to facilitate their escape. Such morality may be found in the abolition journals of the day.

4. The glory of God is promoted by the cheerful obedience and faithful conduct of Christian slaves. Such conduct adorns the doctrine of God our Saviour. Now, we put it to our brethren, whether this course of conduct, in Christian slaves, is not much more likely to win their masters, and all others, to embrace the doctrine from which it springs, than the stealing and running off, which they recommend. Are those who engage in running negroes to Canada, "adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour, in all things?" We put it to your consciences, Brethren!

Proof II.—Col. iii. 22; iv. 1; "Servants, obey in all things, your masters according to the flesh; not with

eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; and, whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons. Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye, also, have a master in heaven."

1. Here, strict obedience is enjoined to masters, "according to the flesh"—that is, masters in regard to worldly things. 2. This obedience is not merely outward, but inward; sincerely, and truly rendered. In which he shows how obedience in carnal things is consistent with spiritual obedience to the Lord. In obeying your earthly masters, in all things, [lawful, that is] you obey your heavenly Master too—"ye serve the Lord Christ." 3. The servant, *doulos*—the slave that does wrong—that withholds due service from his master, that purloins, or is, in any way, unfaithful, shall be punished for his wrong doing. If he obey the counsels of modern abolitionists, God the Redeemer will judge him. 4. As injustice is forbidden to the servants, so injustice is forbidden to the masters. Wrong is prohibited on both sides. For wrong, the master will be punished as well as the slave.

But the question arises, what is just and equal? Our Brethren will say, that it means, among other things, liberty. But this text does not say so, nor does any other. On the contrary, it is implied, that the relation continues. The masters are masters still; and the slaves are slaves still; and it is to the *existing relation* the whole context applies. If the relation is annihilated, the duties of obedience, here enjoined, can no longer exist. This,

then, is mere subterfuge. What is just and equal? Undoubtedly, kind treatment; comfortable food, and raiment, and instruction in all the blessed doctrines of the Bible. These things, good, believing masters do; and, in so doing, obey God, and give more than is commonly given to hired servants. We are often told that they ought to set them free and pay them wages. Well, perhaps they ought to free them. But this will depend upon circumstances. As to paying wages, it is notorious, and the abolitionists have shown it a hundred times, that the slaves are often paid higher wages than the free blacks or whites: using the term wages in the strict sense of political economy. "We must be careful," says Prof. Vethake, (p. 33,) "not to confound the real wages of the laborer, with his money wages. The latter, as has been before stated, are only instrumental in procuring the former. The laborer, who receives money for his services, exchanges it again for the necessaries and comforts of life, both of a material and immaterial nature, which he is enabled by means of it to obtain; and the money is only transitorily in his possession." The real wages of labor are food, clothing, houseroom, education—all the necessaries and comforts of life. But now it is proverbial, that many slaves devour their masters—they consume more than they produce—they receive more wages than they earn—they get more than is just and equal. And this constitutes an argument, not on moral or religious grounds, but simply on the ground of political economy, against the whole system; which I think entirely unanswerable. It has been demonstrated ten thousand times, that slave labor is, upon the whole, the dearest, and cannot compete with free labor. Would you, Mr. Moderator, or any of these brethren, take a common laborer, with a family,

and obligate yourself to feed, clothe, house, and educate them as laborers and Christians, at your own cost, making yourself, and your heirs, liable for them, for the space of forty years? I mean, all moral considerations aside, and receiving the question as a mere dollar and cent matter—would you? Where is the man that would do it? Still, the deficient production results from the system; and, combined with a law before mentioned. constitutes the physical necessity, whereby the Creator provides for removing the evils of oppressive bondage. But we may not run out in this direction.

Proof III.—1 Pet. ii. 18: "Servants, be subject to your masters, with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." This is part of a context, where the relative duties of social life are enjoined—magistrates and subjects, servants and masters, husbands and wives, are addressed.

1. The term servant, is different; it is, *oiketes*, a house servant. But that it implies here, a slave, is evident, from the treatment to which they were exposed—"they suffered wrongfully"—"were buffeted"—"endured grief," and are commanded to submit and bear it patiently, out of conscience towards God. Now this is inconceivable, in regard to hired servants, or any temporary engagement.

2. The subjection enjoined, is to *despotais*, absolute masters.

3. The term by which he expresses the subjection, is also strong: it means the absolute, rigid subordination of military government; where not the least hesitancy, or delay, or demurring, is tolerated.

4. The fear with which they are to submit, also shews the relation of master and slave.

The whole drift of the passage is plain and easy. It enforces the duty of submission, in all things not sinful

before God, upon the slaves; even in extreme cases of harsh and cruel treatment; and that from the consideration that the God whom they serve, will be glorified by it, and the religion they profess will be commended to the hearts of all men. Could Peter, moved by the Holy Ghost, have done all this, if the very relation of master and slave, was, in itself, and, independently of all contingent abuses, a sinful relation?

Proof IV.—Philemon was a slaveholder, at least, if owning one slave makes a man a slaveholder. Onesimus, his slave, had fallen under the influence of bad counsel; whether the dictate of his own heart, or of some ancient anti-slavery partizan. He ran off from his master, who resided at Colosse, a city in the interior of Asia Minor. See Col. iv. 8, 9: "Tychicus have I sent unto you * * * with Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you." This may show a special reason, why Paul, in this epistle to the Colossians, which was undoubtedly carried by Tychicus and Onesimus, presses, as we have seen, the duties of servants to their masters, according to the flesh. The letter was carried by a runaway slave, now returned to his sound mind, and hereby commanded to obey his master.

This runaway found himself at Rome, and came to hear Paul preach in his chains, in his own hired house; and was, through grace, converted unto God; after which, Paul sent him back to his master. Let us note particulars.

1. The apostle recognizes Philemon's right to Onesimus' service—verses 13, 14: "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel. But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly." Paul lived in his own hired house, yet he was in chains, and needed some

person to do his errands, lay in and cook his food, wash his clothes, &c., &c. These kind of services, Philemon had done, or caused to be done, for the apostle, when at Colosse, as is most likely, from this verse and the 22nd, where he requests him to "prepare me also a lodging." But, however much Paul needed Onesimus, and however assured he felt, that did Philemon, the master, know the situation of his beloved friend, the apostle, he would have most cheerfully consented to let Onesimus stay and attend upon him, yet could he not consent to keep him, without his master's *expressed will.*

2. Onesimus was a slave. Paul urges Philemon to receive him, "not now as a *doulos*, but above a *doulos*, a brother beloved, especially to me; but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord."

"Not now"—*ouketi—not any longer*, as a *doulos.* Here is the distinct implication that, heretofore, he had been treated as a slave—a *doulos*—but now, no longer is he to be so treated. This alludes to the Levitical law, already explained. Lev. xxv. 39–42. The Hebrew is to treat his brother Hebrew, now his *Ebed*—his *doulos* —his slave—not like slaves are commonly treated, *with rigor*, but as *soukeers*—hired men are usually treated, with kindness and lenity. *Now*, says Paul, this *doulos* is a brother, and our law requires such to be kindly treated, and "I know that you will do even more than I say," verse 21.

3. In this last expression, there is a hint at emancipation. It is highly probable, that Philemon not only treated him kindly, but set him free, and assisted him to some farther education, and thus enabled him to enter the ministry. Such things have been done, and are continually doing in our own day, in regard to indented apprentices, and even to slaves. Several talented and efficient preachers,

now in Liberia, were thus manumitted. But now, this very thing, which I understand to be admitted by some of our anti-slavery brethren, contains the whole for which I am here contending, viz: that slavery existed, and obedience was commanded, in the New Testament.

4. Paul does not *command* Philemon to *liberate* Onesimus. He does not even *command* him to receive him and treat him kindly. But he does say he might do this latter—he has authority to *enjoin*—to *command*—verse 8: yet he prefers to put himself in the position of an equal with Philemon, and entreat him. From this it has been argued—rather assumed, that he had power to order Philemon to *emancipate* him, but forbore to exercise it. This is wholly gratuitous, groundless, and false. The *power* which, in verse 8, he asserts he has, he turns into an *entreaty*, and it is, that the master would receive his slave and treat him no longer as a slave, but according to the law, with lenity, as a brother.

5. Another point illustrated here, is the pilfering character of runaway slaves. Onesimus had taken the precaution, in our day given as advice by some abolitionists, to supply his pockets, from his master's stores, before he left him. Verse 18: "If he have wronged thee, or oweth thee aught, put that on mine account," &c. So punctiliously regardful is he of the master's rights, that he renders himself liable, as a surety, for all the property the slave may have stolen from his master. Again, Mr. Moderator, let me call your attention to the strong contrast, between the morality of the New Testament, and that of modern abolitionism. This encourages the slave to disobey, to steal, to run off; that commands him to return, to be honest, to be obedient.

But a recent discovery has been made in the laboratory of Greek criticism. It is now ascertained, that Onesimus

was merely the younger brother of Philemon—that he did not like the vigilant and close treatment of his older brother, who was his legal guardian—that he went off, and Paul sent him back. Now, Mr. Moderator, you must not smile at this. It is, indeed, ludicrous; but then, laughable as the thing is, in itself, we must not always treat things with that contempt which their merits demand. This criticism is advanced, in serious earnest, and we must bite in our lips, and seem to be grave in our reply.

Well, on what is this new theory founded? Why, simply on the phrase, *in the flesh*, verse 16. It is asserted that Onesimus was a brother of Philemon, both "in the flesh and in the Lord." Ah! but does the text say this? Or does it say that Onesimus was *beloved*—"both in the flesh"—that is, in regard to civil and temporal affairs, "and in the Lord"—that is, in regard to spiritual things? It needs not Greek spectacles to see, that there is a comparison drawn between Paul and Philemon, in reference to the measure, or degree of attached feeling towards Onesimus. Paul says, that Onesimus is now a brother—to whom? To Philemon, and to Paul, too—though he calls him his son: but he is a *beloved* brother —*beloved* to whom?—"to me;" yes, and "unto thee." But, in what degree, is he beloved to them respectively? Why, "especially." But, *especially* what? Is it especially *beloved*, or is it especially a *brother?* Which word does the adverb *especially*, qualify?—*beloved* or *brother?* Most assuredly it cannot qualify *brother;* but it can, and does qualify *beloved:* he is *beloved* in a high degree—"especially to me;" but in *a higher degree*—"how much more to thee"—*beloved*, "both in the flesh, and in the Lord." Clearly, if the thing were possible, that the adverb, *especially*, and the adverbial phrase, *how much more*, could

qualify *brother*, then we would have the ludicrous idea presented, of Onesimus being a brother germain to Paul, and to Philemon, both; but that he was more a brother to Philemon, than to Paul!!"

There are two other objections to this novel criticism. It requires proof, that the older brother was a master, and the younger his slave, *doulos*. We doubt much whether any sane man will undertake to prove this historically. The other is, that the phrase, *in the flesh*, is the same in its meaning, with *according to the flesh*, which we have seen used in the epistle to the Colossians, written at the same time with that to Philemon, and sent by the same messengers. The sense is not equivocal—*in the flesh*, or *according to the flesh*, is simply, *as to worldly affairs;* and *in the spirit*, or *in the Lord*, or *according to the spirit*, *as to spiritual affairs*.

Proof V.—Eph. vi. 5–9: "Servants, be obedient unto them who are your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ. * * * And ye masters, do the same things unto them; forbearing threatening," &c.

Here, again, all the points are sustained. The relation exists. The duties of servants—slaves—are prescribed, in peremptory language. The distinction is noted between the master, as to the flesh—as to worldly affairs, and Christ, the spiritual master, and the general consistency of their service to both; and the reward of faithfulness is held out as a motive. The masters are commanded "to do the same things," that is, to carry out the same spirit of good-will towards them, in gentle and kind treatment, which the servants are commanded to practice, and with an eye to their own accountability to God. Not one word can here be found encouraging servants to steal a horse, and run away; not one hint to masters about the

sin of slavery, and the duty of repenting of it; and no command to manumit their slaves.

Proof VI.—1 Tim. vi. 1–5: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God, and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved—partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing; but doting about questions, and strifes of words; whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such, withdraw thyself."

We are to bear in mind, that these are among the instructions given by an aged and experienced minister, under the spirit of inspiration, to a youth in the service. When we connect with this the very brief space covered by the whole epistle, we must conclude that Paul thought the subject of slavery a delicate and important one, that he could afford it so much space. Let us carefully analyze the context.

1. The persons spoken to, are slaves, *doulvi*, and the correlate term, is *despotoi*—masters—absolute in authority over them.

2. But the spirit of inspiration, foreseeing the mischief which misguided zeal would occasion in the premises, and the twisting and wrenching of scripture, which would attend its efforts, has appended a phrase, which cuts off the possibility of plausible cavil. These *douloi* are *under the yoke*, a phrase which undoubtedly signifies bondage,

deep and degraded slavery. This phrase does not again occur in the New Testament. The term yoke, however, does occur five times: rather the Greek word *zugos*. Matt. xi. 29, 30, it is used to signify that perpetual, perfect, absolute, unmurmuring, and everlasting subjection, under which God's redeemed are laid to serve him. "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me * * for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." In Acts xv. 10, it signifies the slavery into which some labored to bring the Gentile converts, to the ceremonial law. * * "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." In Gal. v. 1, the same is called "a yoke of bondage." In Rev. vi. 5, the word is correctly translated "a pair of balances."

Let us inquire how the same Greek word is used, in the Septuagint—the old Greek translation of the Old Testament. Its meaning there may assist us here. If it is there a symbol of bondage—a type of slavery—it creates a strong presumption that it is so here, also.

It is used some fifteen times as the translation of a word that signifies a pair of balances, *mozanayim*, as in Lev. xix. 36; Job vi. 2, and xxxi. 6; Ps. lxii. 9; Prov. xi. 1, &c.

Again, it is used for *Ol*, a word that means the instrument by which oxen, or beasts of burden, draw. This is the natural and proper sense, as in Num. xix. 2: "Bring thee a red heifer * * upon which never came yoke." So, Deut. xxi. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 7–10.

Again, it is used in the figurative sense as the symbol of oppressive bondage. Isa. ix. 4, and x. 27: "Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden;" "His burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed, because of

the anointing." And, xiv. 25, the same; and, xlvii. 6, "Upon the ancient hast thou very heavily laid thy yoke." So, Jer. ii. 20; and v. 5; and xxvii. 8, 11, 12; and xxviii. 2, 4, 11, 14; and xxx. 8; Lam. iii. 27; Ezek. xxxiv. 27.

Again, Isa. lviii. 6, the Greek word is used, for one which means the *bows* of the yoke, the bands, or whatever fastens the yoke on the neck; and thus is very suitable to express the idea of bondage. Thus, it is clear, that, *to be under the yoke*, is to be in a state of *slavery*. To have the *yoke broken off*, is to be *made free*. This will be admitted by all abolitionists: for they use Isa. lviii. 6, very constantly in their prayers, and, I suppose, in their arguments: "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens; and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke."

Mr. Moderator, it has been argued on this floor, from this very passage, that we are bound to manumit all the slaves. We have here an admission, which might have saved me the preceding labor. However, it is performed, and you have it. You have also the concession of the opposite side, that to be under the yoke, means to be *slaves*. Let us keep this. The *douloi* of whom Paul here speaks, our abolition brethren admit, *were slaves*. But then, what will we do with Isaiah? We will take his language for just what it means. And it is obvious, at a glance, that the prophet is correcting abuses, in the context referred to. As in the days of Nehemiah, the Hebrews had gradually disregarded the laws relative to the treatment of their slaves: they did not release at the end of the sixth year, nor even at the jubilee; they treated their Hebrew servants with rigor, contrary to law. These illegal exactions he would correct. The law forbid the Hebrew to make his brother serve with

rigor; this, Isaiah would restore—"to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens." The law ordered the servant to be set free, of whom the master had broken a tooth, or destroyed an eye: this, the prophet enforces, "and to let the oppressed—*the broken*, as it signifies, go free: that is, for his eye's or his tooth's sake. The law made all Hebrew slaves free at the end of six years; and here the prophet, like Nehemiah, enforces the law: "Let every man, who is entitled by the law, to his freedom, go free—break ye off every yoke." To infer, from the general term, "*every* yoke," that those who were not, by law, entitled to freedom, must obtain it, is not to interpret, but to pervert the prophet's language. "Servants, obey your masters in all things," is Paul's injunction. No, to infer that they are to do things in obedience to man, which God has forbidden, is to pervert, and not to interpret Paul. So here, exactly. To infer, from the general term, *every* yoke, that the prophet means to oblige the Israelite to manumit those servants, whom the law expressly says he may keep as servants for ever, is not to explain Isaiah, but to pervert his obvious intent and meaning.

Again: the servants, in this context, are "exhorted to account their own masters worthy of *all honor*;" hence, according to the mode of interpretation we refute, the inference must be, that they should account these masters worthy of divine worship, for this is included in *all honor*; if *every yoke* necessarily means *all slaves* absolutely, and all absolutely are commanded, by Isaiah, to be set free; then, *all honor* must include divine reverence and adoration; and so, these slaves must worship their masters as gods. Such absurdities follow from neglect of that canon of interpretation, which sound criticism and common sense have, for ages, established and deemed incontrovertible,

namely, that general terms must be subjected to such restrictions, as the nature of the subject, and the scope or drift of the writer require. In the present instance, by this rule, *all honor*, means all honor properly belonging to the relation of master and servant, as regulated by the laws and reputable usages of the community. So in Isaiah, *all yokes*, or *every yoke*, means every one, which, according to law, and reputable use, required to be broken off.

3. My third remark, on this passage of Timothy, is, that these *douloi under the yoke*, are exhorted to account their own masters worthy of all honor. The word for masters, is *despotas*—absolute lords. It was before stated, that this is a strong term. It is used in Simeon's prayer, Luke ii. 29: "*Lord*, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." In Acts iv. 24: * * * "*Lord*, thou art God." Rev. vi. 10: "How long, O *Lord*." Jude iv.: "Denying the only *Lord* God," &c. The term properly signifies absolute lord or master, and this has its proper correlate in *doulos, a slave*. Now, these despots are to be accounted worthy of all honor; and Christian slaves are commanded not to despise their believing masters, but to serve them—to perform the part of slaves to them—*douleuetosan*. Here is the very contradictory—the exact opposite of abolitionism. Instead of contemning, and despising, and purloining, and running away from their masters, as some teach they ought, these slaves are exhorted, and commanded, to respect and love, to abide with, and faithfully to serve, their despots.

4. We may observe, again, the reason, enforcing this obedience and respectful demeanor. It is, that the religion of these Christian slaves may be commended to their masters, and to all men. Christianity is not a religion

of violent civil and political revolutions: it never organizes a political party. Its interference—rude and violent interference with civil arrangements, would cause its author's name to be blasphemed, and his doctrines to be abhorred and rejected.

5. Timothy is not left at liberty to teach, or not to teach, this doctrine of the subordination of slaves to their own masters. Paul lays it on him peremptorily. "These things teach and exhort." It is quite possible, that the colonizationists, the only true and efficient friends of the colored race, have fallen behind the line of duty in this thing. For love of peace—from an earnest desire to avoid violent excitement, we have neglected Paul's injunction. We have so held back, as to produce the impression upon the minds of the opponents of Paul's doctrine, that we felt ourselves at a loss for anything to say in his defence. You have seen them in this Synod, daring, and braving, and bantering us.

> "I am for peace, but when I speak,
> For battle they are keen."

6. The apostle points out the origin of the opposite teaching. And here, Mr. Moderator, I am sorry I shall be obliged to say some things extremely unpleasant—unpleasant to our brethren; hard for them to endure, because they will come with blistering severity—unpleasant for me to utter, only because of the pain they may occasion; the alienation of affection, the heart-burnings and jealousies that will probably follow: not because they are uncalled for and avoidable; they are become imperiously necessary. These very brethren have made the issue and forced us upon it. Faithfulness to God's word will no longer tolerate mincing and mouthing with great caution. We must expound it according

to its plain and obvious truth and meaning. If the two-edged sword meet with matter to cut, let it cut. If a festering ulcer fret and fatten on the body ecclesiastical, let the scalpel reach its core, and let the probe search its depth.

I say, then, that Paul finds the origin of abolitionism in the vanity, self-conceit, and puffed up pride of the human heart. "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words," &c. Now, to teach otherwise, is to teach other and opposite doctrine to that which he teaches, viz: that slaves should respect, love, and serve their own masters. If any man teach opposite to these doctrines—if he teach modern anti-slavery doctrines, such as abound in their publications and speeches, he is *tetuiphotai—proud* we have it translated. But I appeal to every Greek scholar, if it do not mean *vain, puffed up, self-conceited.* But I will not trust to Greek scholars only. I will refer you to better authority—1 Tim. iii. 6. Speaking of the qualifications of a bishop, Paul says, he must be, "Not a novice, lest *being lifted up with pride—tuiphotheis*—he fall into the condemnation of the devil." The word in our text, then, translated "he is proud," means such a lifting up with pride, as greatly endangers the person's falling into the condemnation of the devil.

Again, 2 Tim. iii. 4; speaking of the last days—the days in which we live, Sir, and of the perilous times that shall come, he says, "Men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud * * traitors, heady, *high-minded, tetuphomenoi.*" Does not this mean, puffed up with vain pride and contemptible self-conceit?

This form of the word does not again occur in the New Testament; but nearly the same we have once, Matt. xii. 20, "The *smoking* flax he will not quench,"

tuphomenon linon. The primary idea is taken from the thick vapory smoke, which ascends from damp straw or weeds, when they are kindled with fire, but before the flame acquires strength to consume the foggy smoke. How forcibly does this describe the state of a self-conceited mind, which supposes itself the origin of light, and truth, and wisdom; and wrapping itself round and round in the fog and smoke of its own vanity, and ascending amid the cloud of its own incense, looks down with pity or with scorn, upon the ignorant world below!

The history of modern abolitionism, as to its origin, will be found to tally with this picture. A vigorous young man was refused promotion in the service of the American Colonization Society; he became offended, removed to a neighboring city, set up an opposition paper, and thus became the father of the modern anti-slavery movement. Who the mother may have been, is now difficult to tell. That honor may, perhaps, by a little slip of chronology, be conferred on Abby Kelly—at least, she is laboriously discharging the duties of a dry nurse.

7. Let us mark, in the last place, the consequences of a system of movements, which has such an origin. Could they be expected to be characterized by meekness, wisdom, humility, brotherly kindness, charity? As well might the lamb and kid claim paternity from the hyena and the wolf. But see what Paul says;—"Whereof cometh envy, strife, railing, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth." To this charge, Mr. Moderator, our brethren of this Synod, on behalf of the original abolitionists, now the Garrison and Abby Kelly party, have pleaded guilty. They have distinctly admitted the correctness

of Paul's prophetic representations. But for themselves—and thus far we gladly admit the plea—and for the great body of abolitionists, they plead not guilty; and attempt to wash their hands of all the infidel party's doings. But we must not—whilst we let off our brethren individually, and as ministers of God, from the weight of this charge—we must not, and we cannot, in faithfulness to Paul and to truth, let the abolition movement escape. We contend, that the *infidel abolitionists—the no government men and women—the anarchical party*, are the real, true, and only consistent anti-slavery men and women. They are the sound logicians, who have fearlessly followed out the fundamental principle of the movement. It were easy to show, that, if you once admit the simple relation of master and servant, irrespective of cruelty and abuses, to be, in itself, sinful, then you must deny the morality of a temporary existence of the relation; for if it is a sin, in itself, it must be so whether it be of long or short duration. Surely, if to hold a man in bondage for life—say thirty years—is a sin; to hold him ten, five, one year, is a sin too. But the relation of parent and child involves obligations of the latter to obey the former; hence, this, too, must be abandoned. Next goes that of husband and wife. Next, that of civil ruler and ruled. The original abolitionists have clearly seen, that all these relations are spoken of in the same Scriptures that speak of master and servant; and they have logically inferred, that the arguments which go to make the simple relation a sin, in the one, will equally nullify the whole. The infidel abolitionists are the sound reasoners in this case. We, therefore, hold the *movement*, as a whole, responsible for the horrible results which our brethren, here, deplore equally with us.

Thus, by six plain passages of Scripture, have I proved the fourth and fifth propositions, that the New Testament recognizes the existence of slavery; and that it prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and masters to their servants; and yet, in no instance, does it forbid slaves to obey, or masters to retain their slaves: no text commands masters to liberate their slaves.

Let us now hear the conclusion of the whole Scriptural argument. I have demonstrated five distinct propositions in regard to the Old Testament, which see.

As to the New Testament, I have laid down two distinct general propositions, and supported them by five distinct subordinate ones:—

I. *There is not a sentence in the New Testament which expressly forbids the having and the holding of a slave.*

II. *There is not a sentence in the New Testament which, by fair and just interpretation, according to the rules of grammar, gives ground for the logical inference that the simple holding of a slave or slaves is inconsistent with Christian profession and Christian character.*

The five which go to prove the truth of these are:—

I. *That the Greek word,* doulos, *usually translated* servant, *properly and commonly means a person held to service for life—a slave.*

This was proved by a reference to all the cases of its occurrence in the New Testament, by classes; and by its contrast with the opposite term, *eleutheros*—this means *free; doulos* is the opposite, and must mean a *slave.*

II. With an inference. *Paul advises servants to abide quietly in their condition. This he could not do, if the relation of master and servant were, in itself, a sin.*

This was proved, and the inference was sustained.

III. With an inference. *The New Testament recognizes some masters as good men—true and faithful believers.*

Therefore, the relation of master and slave may exist consistently with Christian character and profession.

IV. *The New Testament recognizes the existence of slavery.*

V. *The New Testament prescribes the duties of servants to their masters, and of masters to their servants; enjoining obedience to the one, and kind treatment from the other.*

As to these propositions, both relative to the Old and New Testaments, I am aware the practiced logician may take exception on the ground of *form* and *arrangement:* he may say, they are not always distinct—they overlap in some places. This is admitted, and was, perhaps, not wholly avoidable, in an argument designed not exclusively for the practiced reasoner, but mainly for the popular mind. Their truth, however, is the main matter; and to this I invite the attention of any who may choose to reply. I hope the brethren will not flinch. If any man chooses to controvert any one of them, let him do it; not by declaiming against the horrors of slavery, or the impiety of asserting that the Bible tolerates it. Let us not have popular appeals, but logical, scriptural argument. Let no man content himself with a tirade against my inferences; let him come up fearlessly to my propositions. If he can refute them, or any of them, then, he may shake public confidence in the inferences. Until then, they will stand unmoved in the solid judgment of thinking men, whatever excitement may be raised by pathetic appeals to human sympathy, and the weaknesses of men and women.*

* It is worthy of remark, that although every effort was made, in the delivery of this speech in Synod, to invite attention to the above propositions, and every thing done which the speaker could think of to *provoke* the opposition to deny them, or any of them, and to bring plain Scripture command to masters, to liberate their slaves, not one of the

The inferences which I deduce from the preceding propositions are two, viz:—

I. *According to the Bible, a man may stand in the relation of a master and hold slaves, and yet be a fair, and reputable, and consistent professor of the religion of the Bible.*

II. *There is no power on earth—no authority in the Church, to make the holding, or the not holding of a slave, a term of communion, or condition of admission to the privileges of the Church.*

For cruelty to their slaves, in any form—for unkind and harsh treatment—for violent and abusive language, even masters may be censured, and if such offences against the Word of God be persevered in, may be suspended and ultimately excommunicated. But if a master treats his servants as the Bible commands him to do, there is no power in Church officers, to censure or excommunicate him, simply because he is a master—because he holds slaves. Hence, the *Corollary:* Whoever assume and exercise such power, do therein usurp the prerogative of the King and Head of the Church, and expose themselves to the penalties of such as lord it over God's heritage. Such violate a plain precept of God's word:—"Be not many masters;" "neither as being lords over God's heritage." They thrust themselves into the throne, and exercise a power which Christ has not granted to the officers of the Church; but which he has

propositions was denied by any speaker, and no man ever asserted that the Bible commands masters to free their slaves. A speech of about six and a half hours was delivered, chiefly in direct reply to this, yet no attempt was made to disprove one of the points taken, nor was one of them directly denied; nor was it protended, by any of the speakers, that the Bible commands masters to manumit their slaves, nor was their inability to do any of these things manfully acknowledged by any of the brethren.

forbidden to be exercised. They become, themselves, the usurping despots, and make the freemen of God their slaves.

You see, Mr. Moderator, I proceed upon the principle, that the King of Zion, only, can settle the terms or conditions of admission to membership in his visible kingdom. If any man deny this, I cannot, here, enter into controversy with him. But, assuming this as indubitably true, the corollary follows, by an inevitable logical necessity.

What, then, have we gained by this whole argument? Simply this—*that slavery—the relation of master and slave*—not, you will observe, any violence; not any cruel treatment; but simply the *relation, is tolerated in the Holy Scriptures.* I have not said the Bible *sanctions* it—the Bible *commands* it, except in the case of forfeiture of liberty by crime. But the Bible permits it: no where does it command masters to manumit their slaves.

This, Mr. Moderator, some of our brethren have found themselves too honest-hearted to deny. Some have fully admitted it. One excellent brother, seeing no room for denial, proceeded to argue thus against me, admitting the position I have elaborated, as true. What if the Bible of old did tolerate slavery? Does it hence follow that it must be tolerated now? The Bible tolerated polygamy. Here is a parallel case, and you will be obliged, by this argument, to tolerate this evil. The Hebrews held slaves, and were, notwithstanding, members of God's Church; hence, it is inferred, Christians may hold slaves, and yet be, and continue, members of God's Church. But, said our good brother, the temper of whose steel I understand, and can, therefore, make free to try its edge, if this argument is good for the toleration of slavery, it is also good for the toleration of polygamy. For, the Hebrews often had a plurality of wives and concubines, and were,

notwithstanding, accounted reputable members of the Church: consequently, Christians may indulge in polygamy, and yet occupy a reputable standing in the Church.

Such was the brother's argument, as I think every one in the house must have understood it; and, I admit, it is very plausible, and would be conclusive, if he would prove one thing, viz: that polygamy is *tolerated* in the New Testament. Then, the cases would be exactly analogous. But exact similarity is indispensable to truth and safety, in an analogical argument: and, therefore, until it shall be shown, that polygamy existed, and was not forbidden, in the New Testament, as I have shown that slavery existed, and was not forbidden, the argument is not a tripod—it is only a biped; and a stool cannot stand on two legs. But this *postulatum necessarium*—this indispensable point, cannot be sustained; for it is the reverse of truth. The New Testament prohibits polygamy. Mark x. 6—8: "But from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh: so, then, they are no more twain, but one flesh." Here is a prohibition, not only of causeless divorce, but of polygamy. A man can have but one wife, says the Redeemer; and this is the original law of man's creation. Moses tolerated your departures from this law, "for the hardness of your hearts;" but now, the original law is placed before you. Accordingly, wherever the duties of husbands are spoken of, there can be found no recognition of two or more wives to one husband, "for the husband is the head of *the wife*. Let every one so love *his wife*, even as himself, and *the wife* see that she reverence her husband." Eph. v. 23. Always, one only, is implied. But again, 1 Tim. iii. 2, describing the qualifications of a bishop, Paul says, he

must be "the husband of one wife;" and so, verse 12: "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife." So, Tit. i. 6: * * * "The husband of one wife." Now these show, that polygamy had been tolerated, but now is no longer to be tolerated. It is censured as a disqualification for any office in the Church. No matter what qualifications, otherwise, a man may have for office, if he have more than one wife, he is excluded from office. Now, let our anti-slavery brethren produce us a declaration of Our Redeemer, to this amount, that slavery, which Moses tolerated, is not any longer to be *tolerated*, that no slave holder shall be a deacon, a presbyter, or a bishop. Let them do this, and their analogical argument is good, and we will abandon the defence. Thus, we shut them in.

But some brethren in the opposition seem, to me, Mr. Moderator, to have gone somewhat farther towards giving up the ship. Did not your ear catch an argument to this amount? "It is not slavery, in the abstract, we oppose; we disregard abstractions. We oppose slavery as it exists in these United States. This, we say, is a sin, and against this, we lift up our voice, and would have this Synod to condemn it. Let abstract relations go to the wall; but let us attack the actual, living reality." Surely, sir, you heard this. Well, what is its concession? Does it not concede their inability to occupy a foothold on the ground of the civil, social relation of master and slave? Does it not concede that they are able only to assault the abuses, "the cruelty, and tyranny, and oppression, so often connected with it?" I think one prominent debater admitted, in so many words, that he would not, or could not, contend against the abstract relation; but, against the practical system, he felt able and determined to contend. Well, if they abandon the principle in dispute, let us, for a moment, look at the practical argument.

Allow me to state it in full logical form, namely: All things, which involve many great and crying moral evils, ought immediately to be abandoned and abolished.

But slavery, as it exists, and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils.

Therefore, slavery, as it exists, and is practiced in the United States, ought immediately to be abandoned and abolished.

Is not this the pith and substance of all their arguments? And who will point out one logical defect about it? Notwithstanding its plausibility, let us apply the argument to other social relations, and see how it will work.

Marriage, or the relation of husband and wife, as it exists, and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore, it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Is not this identically the same argument? Does it not rest on the same major, namely, all things which involve great and crying moral evils, ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Do you not admit the expressed minor? Can any man deny, that husbands and wives, in the United States, do often quarrel and wrangle in the very matters of duty belonging to the relation? Is there no hellish jealousy, no open abuse of power, no violent treatment, no abandonment, no horrid murder committed? Clearly, the minor is true, and the conclusion inevitable.

Again: the parental relation, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore, it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Most assuredly, harsh, unkind treatment, violent beating, resulting in death sometimes—lessons of impurity, even to compulsory prostitution; and all the natural results —lying, swearing, stealing, quarrelling, drunkenness—all these are involved in, and brought about by the parental

relation: the conclusion is logical, it ought to be immediately abolished.

Yet again, civil government, as it exists and is practiced in the United States, involves many great and crying moral evils; therefore, it ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished. Does any man deny the minor? Will any man say, there are no moral abominations practiced in our government and our politics? Are fraud and villainy no moral evils? Are perjury and falsehood no moral evils? Are slander and defamation no moral evils? Are stabbing, and dirking, and shooting men—with all the blasphemous language which usually accompanies such things—are these no moral evils? You see, sir, the conclusion closes in upon us: our civil government ought to be immediately abandoned and abolished.

Examine every one of these, and see whether there be any difference in their construction. Persuaded I am, no man, who understands what an argument is, will deny their exact similarity—their logical identity. But will our brethren take the conclusions? If not, will they be so good as to point out the fallacy, in their own argument? or so candid, as to admit its existence?

The fallacy here, is in one term, and springs from the accident. "All things which *involve* moral evils." Slavery *involves* moral evils. Things may be involved *necessarily* or *accidentally*. Blue paper involves arsenic; not *necessarily*, but only *contingently*. Arsenic *involves* a poisonous quality; not *contingently*, but *necessarily*. Anger involves moral evil; not *necessarily*, but only *contingently*. "Be ye angry and sin not." Murder involves moral evil; not contingently, but necessarily. Thus, you see, that before you can draw the conclusion, that our civil government ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily involves* villainy, perjury, falsehood, &c. But

that these evils are separable, at least in a high degree, from it, must be admitted; and, therefore, the conclusion is not correct.

Before you can infer, that the parental relation ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove, that it *necessarily* involves the evils of cruelty, &c.

Before you can infer, that marriage ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily* involves jealousy, angry contention, and murder.

Before you can infer, that slavery ought to be immediately abolished, you must prove that it *necessarily* involves many great and crying evils. If these are contingent and avoidable, the inference is illogical; it springs from the fallacy of the accident.

But there is another question to be met, before you can infer that our government ought to be abolished. Be it even conceded, that all the evils enumerated are not avoidable, that some cannot, in the present state of human nature, be entirely remedied; will it, even then, follow, that civil government ought to be abolished? Certainly not. The previous question is, would the abolition of our government, because some evils involved in it are unavoidable, be a removal of these evils and involve fewer? Unless this can be answered affirmatively, clearly, the inference against it is illogical. So, were it proved, that all the evils involved in American Slavery, are not avoidable, but some are necessarily involved; still it will not follow, that it ought at once to be abolished, unless it can be shown that this abolition would remove the remaining evils, and not introduce greater.

We have been told, the golden rule, "Love thy neighbor as thyself—all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," makes

directly against the very existence of slavery, and leads to immediate abolition. But the direct reverse of the latter is true. The Golden rule will not suffer immediate abolition, except in the special cases, where the slaves are, at the time, in a capacity and circumstances in which freedom would be a real benefit to them. To turn out slaves into the kind of freedom which they enjoy—rather which they endure and suffer in our Free States, of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York—with the habits, the education, the ignorance of men and business which they mostly labor under, would be to act a cruel part, directly in opposition to the Saviour's golden rule. No man but a fool would wish to be thus set free. No, Mr. Moderator, the man in whose hands Divine Providence has thrown any of his fellow men in this form, is bound by every tie that can bind the soul of man, not to set them free, until he can do it to their advantage. He may feel them a heavy burden—a charge weighty and difficult to manage; but he is bound, by God's authority, to sustain the charge, to endure the labor of caring for them, making them work, feeding, clothing, and instructing them, and thus fitting them for the use of freedom, and so leading on to that result, whenever it can be done consistently with the highest interests of the community. The opposite doctrine is radicalism, and leads to the subversion of all order and law. We have a sample of it often in the treatment of children. Some parents take no control over their children. They are too indolent, and have too little conscience to feel the obligation to rule their household. Their children enjoy a vast amount of liberty—that is, of reckless criminality—freedom from all restraints; and, of course, they become the pests of society, and, ultimately the inmates of penitentiaries and candidates for the gibbet. But God's

law requires and commands parents to rule their children. They have no right to set them free, until they are first educated and fitted to provide for themselves. So masters are bound to keep their servants in bondage, until they are fitted to be free. Immediate abolition would be, in almost all cases, a gross violation of the universal law of love.

But let us return to the conclusion furnished by the Scriptural argument. Slavery is tolerated in the Bible—it is not made a term of communion by the King of Zion, consequently, the officers of his Church have no power to make it a term of communion. Here is the doctrine for which we contend; and, by this we hope to save this fair land from being deluged in the blood of its inhabitants, and this free nation from the chains of servitude to European despots.

Should the opposite doctrine prevail—should the holding of slaves be made a crime, by the officers of the Churches, the non-slaveholding States, should they break communion with their Southern brethren, and denounce them as guilty of damning sin, as kidnappers and menstealers, as worthy of the penitentiary, as has been done here in this Synod—should this doctrine and this practice prevail throughout the Northern States, can any man be so blind as not to see, that a dissolution of the Union—a civil, and, perhaps, servile war, must be the consequence? Such a war as the world has never witnessed—a war of uncompromising extermination, that will lay waste this vast territory, and leave the despotic powers of Europe exulting over the fall of the Republic? All the elements are here—the physical, the intellectual, the moral—elements for a strife, different, in the horribleness of its character, from anything the world has ever witnessed. Let the spirits

of these men be only once aroused; let their feelings be only once chafed up to the fighting point; let the irritation only be kept up until the North and the South come to blows on the question of slavery, their "contentions will be as the bars of a castle," broken only with the last pulsations of a nation's heart.

CERTIFICATES.

[FROM THE RICHMOND EXAMINER.]

THE NEGRO RACE.—In the able and learned lectures of Mr. Gliddon, our attention was particularly excited by his accounts of the antiquities in the Egyptian province of Monroe, because those antiquities constitute the most striking illustration of negro civilization which history or archæology can produce. Monroe was a country on the Nile, above Egypt. When the last named and most famous seat of ancient civilization was overrun by Cambyses and other cruel conquerors, a portion of the inhabitants retreated up the river and established themselves in Monroe. Hither they transported their old forms of government, of worship, their old arts, and their antique customs. They built temples and excavated tombs; they erected obelisks, they covered them with inscriptions in their hieroglyphic alphabet, and the inscriptions and sculptures—which date with the first generations of this colony—are found to be as perfect as those of the Lower Nile. But the colony was cut off from the body of the nation by intervening deserts and fierce nomads. The number of emigrants was never increased from the old races. Necessarily, the men were in a great disproportion to the women, and they were forced to take their wives and concubines from the captives which they made in their wars with the surrounding and barbarous tribes. Now the Egyptians were of a different race, but these tribes were negroes. Hence, the second generation of the Monroeites were mulattoes. The process of amalgamation continued. They formed harems from their sable purchases: so that the third generation were Samboes. The next were still nearer the negro type, and the work proceeded until all traces of Caucasian blood disappeared, and Monroe was inhabited by a pure black race, like that of the vast regions on its boundaries.

The most interesting circumstance connected with these facts, is, the continued deterioration in the *sculptural* remains of the country, and *their final cessation with the disappearance of the white blood.* The inscriptions and portraits of the original emigrants, as before said, are equal to those of the old Empire. But, in those of their mulatto children, their is a great difference. The sculpture is clumsy—the inscriptions in bad grammar and in worse orthography. The next are inferior even to those; and, in the succeeding generation, it becomes evident that they *wholly lost the language,* and, no longer understood what they wrote The inscriptions are nothing more than miserable copies from the earlier works: so that on a tomb that is evidently of a late date, will be found a badly executed copy of the inscription on the tomb of its owner's great grandfather—even the date and name being unaltered. After that they lost even the power of intelligible imitations, and a few scrawls on uncarved rocks are the latest remains that are found. The Monroeites then cease to be Egyptians even in name and tradition. They have forgotten language, government, religion, and arts. They have no buildings, and no enduring tombs. The province is no longer distinguishable from the country around. The race has relapsed into absolute *negro barbarism.*

This illustration of their incapacity, not merely to attain civilization, but even to retain it when given them, is a type of the universal history of the negro race. The world has their history in its hands for the space of nearly five thousand years. Negroes appear on the sculpture of old Egypt. But in that multitudinous country they were utterly valueless. The Egyptians considered them too stupid to be worth teaching even agricultural drudgery; and we only see their figures when led as captives in the triumph of some belligerent Pharaoh. From that time until this, the negro has never appeared, save in three forms of existence: captivity barbarism, or slavery. The last is the highest form of social life of which experience, at least, permits us to suppose him capable.

Circumstance, could never have kept down any race for five thousand years, which were capable of rising into civilization. All the white races have been, in time, barbarians; but all its branches have, in time, left it, and attained their natural grades of civilization. But the negro has never left the lowest type of barbarism, save for *captivity* or *slavery.* In the vast continent of Africa they have always existed in millions, with no extraordinary circumstances to depress them. But, then, we never hear of them, save as cannibal savages. No such thing as a negro government has ever existed in Africa. Petty kingdoms have existed, and do exist: some with so called cities like Timbuctoo. But the half-clad rulers, in all these kingdoms, are Moors or Fellahs, a branch of the Arab family, and the people of Timbuctoo are Arabs and Fellahs. The

Republic of Liberia can scarcely be called an exception, since it is watched and guided by the Colonization Society, supported on all sides by England and by other governments, is re-enforced every year from the United States, and is governed by Mulattoes. Even, with all this assistance, it exhibits evidences of decay, and of relapsing into the characteristic barbarism of the neighboring native tribes.* Dr. Mechlin, who lived in Liberia five years, and, for part of that time, was governor of that colony, has declared the experiment to be a failure; and died in Mobile, with the declaration, that he saw no hope of ever rendering the negro race fit for self-government. On this continent, they have received the most signal trial. They were protected by civilized States. They possessed the richest islands on the globe, with the richest commerce at their doors. The result is very notorious. Famine ravages, often, that fertile land. Petty but desolating wars occupy its sections. The only government which subsists, is that of a bloody and stupid beast, who is emperor over one corner of the island. Off from the seaports, the people have lost arts, religion, industry, decency—have relapsed into absolute cannibalism. Dr. Nott states, on the authority of an eye witness, that, on two occasions, while travelling in Hayti, he saw the negroes roasting and eating their Dominican prisoners by the road-side.

In the free States of this country, the negro race can reach every advantage which the white man possesses. Many of them are educated. But where have they evinced capacity to make use of our civilization? Where have their best classes achieved a higher destiny than that of *tavern waiters*? Where have their masses risen above the very lowest level of the worst population? Where has any individual even, attained not to say distinction, but respectability in any profession? In England, many negroes who were supposed to exhibit talent when children, have been subjected to the hot bed process of culture, and two or three of these have been brought up to the mark of writing verses. These have been collated into a volume, and Bishop Gregoire, of Blois, has written a stupid book to prove, therefrom, the intellectual equality of the race. But any one who will take the trouble to read these verses will find them, for the most part, a doggerel too poor to be called verses at all; and, whenever a copy occurs, of sufficient merit for the poet's corner

---

* Although this may be true to a limited extent, as is clearly established by evidence of an unquestionable character, yet our desires for the success of this colony, leads us to hope for better results. The Colony of Liberia, affording, as it does, an assylum for the refuse FREE BLACK population of the United States, is deserving of the support and prayers of every Christian philanthropist in Christendom.—EDITOR.

of the smallest kind of country newspaper, its author is sure to turn out a mulatto or quadroon, when the accompanying biographies are referred to.

By the history of the negro race, it is, therefore, incontrovertibly proven, that they are utterly incapable of civilization or development beyond the point of slavery. When the starved barbarian is taken from the wilds of Africa, *clothed well*, fed well, and associated with the whites he quickly acquires a certain degree of health, strength, and intelligence. He will quickly ape the white. But there his development ceases. Beyond that, in no instance, has he ever gone. Without amalgamation with the white race, he remains where he begun, and sinks so soon as the superior influence is withdrawn.

These phenomena are peculiar to the black race. None of the diversified families of the white race exhibit them. To which one of the white races could the advantages be given which lie before the negroes of the United States, without an immediate operation and proof of its talent and its intellectual superiority, in hundreds and thousands of instances? All the white races have been civilized and developed in time, and where circumstances have thrown them back into barbarism, they all exhibit capacity for civilization. But the exact contrary is the characteristic of the negro race.

What deduction is to be drawn from these facts? The plain and inevitable deduction is this: that the negro is a totally distinct race from the Caucasian; that the negro is the connecting link between man and the brute creation; that the negro race is designed by nature to be subordinate to and dependent upon the white or superior races: that the negro race is the result of a different act of the Creator from that which originated the Caucasian, and is, consequently, beyond the scope of those abstract axioms which declare that all races are of one blood and have equal rights natural, social, and political.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT OF THE NASHVILLE AND LOUISVILLE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.]

"BIBLE DEFENCE OF SLAVERY, OR ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE NEGRO RACE."—This is one among the multitudinous publications of the day that is richly worthy a careful perusal by every lover of truth and justice, reason and religion, virtue and humanity. It is what its title imports, a veritable, impregnable defense and vindication of the South, her rights and peculiar policy and institutions. It is no "catch penny," harbingered by an *ignis fatuus* of a murky imagination and a baser cupidity, for purposes of speculation, but a work of masterly ability and most profound research. This peculiarity, of itself, apart from its relevant connection with a mooted and vexed question, would render it

a valuable work to the scholar and divine. But, when we take into consideration its direct bearing upon the absorbing topic of the day, and that it is the production of the ablest divines and profoundest scholars of which the great North, in all her pride and glory, can boast, its intrinsic worth, then, becomes magnified a thousand fold. Its authors, in their patient researches after truth, have explored the mighty ocean of biblical, scientific, and historical lore, in all their heights and depths, lengths and breadths, and planted themselves upon a rock not less firm and immovable than the adamant of ages. Their own adverse education and preconceived opinions vanished before the splendor of their investigations, whilst the sordid vampires of fanaticism and political incendiarism are made to coil their serpent heads, and seek refuge in their native dens and caves of pauperism and degradation whence they come, and where they, unregenerated, belong as a legitimate right.

Charleston, June 16, 1851.

MR. W. S. BROWN,—I have your acceptable favor of the 27th ult. before me. Since I wrote last, the volume you sent me has come to hand, and I have read it with much attention and great gratification. It is an able and comprehensive defence of our Institutions, and I think it will be received every where with congratulation. I have thoroughly examined the book, and regard it as one of the best productions which has ever appeared in defence of the South.

Your book is a favorite in our family, and is, at present, going the rounds, for perusal, by every member.

Very truly and fraternally yours,

EDWIN HERIOT.

Ed. of the Southern Home Journal.

[FROM "THE MONROE DEMOCRAT."]

BIBLE DEFENCE OF SLAVERY.—This is the title of a work just issued from the press, by W. S. BROWN, M.D., Glasgow, Ky. The author maintains that the negroes are the decendants of Ham, and, in fulfillment of the decree of Heaven, have been, in every age, servants of servants; that they are, *mentally*, *morally*, and *physically* constituted to be such, and will be servants in all time to come. These positions are maintained by an appeal to history, to Revelation, and to the character of the negroes. Time will not permit us to enter into any thing like a *review* of this work, but we recommend it to the attention of every man who may

feel an interest (as all necessarily must) in the all-engrossing subjects of slavery and abolitionism.

Let every Southern man read this book, and make up his mind whether slavery is an evil which he should endeavor to extirpate or not. If he decides that it is, then, let him aquiesce in Northern policy, and more, let him openly advocate it, as honest men at the North do, on the ground that it will end in the abolition of slavery. If, on the contrary, he come to the conclusion that slavery is not an evil, but has the sanction of high Heaven, (as this work most clearly shows) and, that it has been a blessing and not a curse, then, let him fearlessly defend his rights, and wage open and manly war upon the policy adopted, expressly and avowedly, for the purpose of overthrowing Southern Institutions.

This book does not touch upon *party* questions as they exist at the south. It is simply what it purports to be, a *defence* of *slavery*, and a very able one too. We hope it will be universally read at the South, and serve, at least, to create harmony of views among southern people. We have little idea that it will be read at the North. A fanaticism that discards the Bible, because it recognizes slavery, is blind and deaf to all that can be said on the subject. *Buy the book and read it.* Patronize those who defend your Institutions.

[THE FOLLOWING IS FROM SENATOR JAS. E. HARRISON, OF MISSISSIPPI.]

THE undersigned takes pleasure in recommending "Bible Defence of Slavery," as being the best production on the subject with which he is acquainted. The whole subject is treated in a *most masterly* manner; exhibiting great research and learning, as well as superior biblical knowledge. The entire work is replete with interest. Every honest inquirer after truth should read it.

JAS. E. HARRISON.

Aberdeen, Miss. Nov. 26th. 1851.

Another scientific gentleman of distinction, in noticing the book, says of it: "It is a rare work, and every man, in the *South* especially, ought to peruse its pages. Many authors have written upon this subject, in times past, but we are convinced that it never has been handled so *effectually* and *learnedly*, as in this work. The Authors are clear, lucid, and forcible. Their arguments are unique, grand, and *weighty*. In a word, they prove themselves superior *Scholars*, and men of great ability, in every step they take in the defence of this great subject."

A CHANCE TO DO GOOD

THE VEXED QUESTION SETTLED—BIBLE DEFENCE OF SLAVERY.—The work bearing the above title we have carefully examined, and can, unhesitatingly, say, that it is the ablest work of the kind we ever saw; and, so far as we have seen or heard, it is without an equal in the English language. Being clearly and fairly based upon the Scriptures, and confirmed by undoubted facts connected with our race, since the flood, it is, therefore, a work of immense value to all persons who wish to know the truth upon the subject of slavery. And particularly so with the people of the South and West, whose liberty, interests, and rights, are now being insulted by European and Northern interference.

W. D. JOURDAN,
THO. H. M. WINN,
W. K. WINN,
A. K. BAGBY,
B. F. DANIS.
H. D. JETT. M.D.

Glasgow, Ky., March 8. 1851.

The above work contains nearly six hundred pages octavo, neatly printed and substantially bound, and will be furnished to subscribers at the very low price of $2 per copy: it being the determination of the publisher to place a copy in the hands of every genuine friend of truth and reason, of the South and her rights. There can be no question of the fact, that the well-being of our race, the peace and prosperity of our common country; the protection of our dearest interests of life and property, and the security of our firesides and family altars, are more intimately connected with the general circulation of this work among the masses, than with that of any other in existence. Its tendency is, not to engender strife or foster error and fanaticism, but to inculcate truth, and give security and permanency to those institutions and relations of life which have been wisely ordained by God, sanctioned by all human experience, and guarantied by the constitution of our common country—the Magna Charta of freedom and human rights. Let, then, every friend of his country and of his God, of the South and her rights, of truth and reason, of protection to life and property, contribute his mite to its support.

W. S. BROWN, *Publisher.*

Jan. 14, 1852 Glasgow, Ky.

[FROM THE "SOUTHERN KENTUCKY ARGUS."]

BIBLE DEFENCE OF SLAVERY.—This is the title of the work of which we made bare mention in our last, and promised a more extended notice this week. It is not possible that positions justified by biblical argument, or reasoning deduced from profane history, can be rendered as clear and conclusive as demonstrations in mathematics; but the authors let in upon their subject, floods of light, which must have very decided and salutary influence upon public sentiment in reference to the "peculiar institution" of the South. On examination of this book—such an one as the multiplicity and arduousness of business engagements would allow—we have found it to be, indeed, what its title imports, *a Defence of Slavery*. It is not, exclusively, drawn from the Holy Scriptures, however. The writers, in the light of many pertinent circumstances, apart from it as well as in that of the bible, carefully examine the subject of slavery, as it relates to the negro race, and gives a more satisfactory account of the origin of black men—of their color—of the causes of their state of servitude, and traces of their character, as well in ancient as in modern times, dealing *en passant*, many pungent and severe strictures upon that pseudo system of philanthropy, or fanaticism, yclept modern abolitionism, which threatens dissolution to the cherished Union of the American States. Finally, the authors propose a plan of national colonization, that is deemed adequate to the removal of the entire free black population of the United States, and all that may hereafter become free, in a manner harmonizing with the well-being of both races. Such is a succinct statement of the main features of the book.

That the authors are men of the North, had been reared and educated there, in the very heart of a community of abolitionists, and, under the strong influence of its deep-rooted and bitter prejudices against slavery, are considerations that must go a great way in recommending any views they may set up in tolerating or justifying the institution. Their opinions can but be regarded weighty—infinitely more entitled to respectful consideration than would be opinions formed in harmony with the prevailing prejudices under which the authors were educated. The conflict of sentiment with the precepts of early training, is the strongest kind of evidence of its soundness, and of the sincerity of the writers promulgating it. These circumstances attending the publication of "Bible Defence of Slavery," must, therefore, have the double effect to insure for it a wide and increasing demand, and, per consequence, as the disquisition is very able and convincing, produce a very decided and marked effect upon the popular mind in relation to its subject matter. And we commend it into the hands of all reading and reflecting men everywhere.

BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE.

A PLAIN SYSTEM

OF

MEDICAL PRACTICE,

FOR

THE USE OF FAMILIES.

By J. W. BRIGHT, M.D.

THIS work embraces all the diseases of MEN, WOMEN, and CHILDREN, and a plain system of MIDWIFERY; and contains the experience of the Author, in more than thirty years extensive practice of Medicine, and is the only work now before the public which contains all the New and Approved Remedies, found in the standard works and medical periodicals in Europe and America, together with the experience and approved practice of the best authors, upon which the successful treatment of the present forms of disease so much depends. It is the only work now before the public, containing a full description of the new, as well as the old diseases of the United States. The Symptoms of each disease, in all its stages, are so minutely described, and the directions for giving and working off the medicines are so plain, that no one can fail to follow them; the remedies all being put down in plain English, in their appropriate places. It also contains a *Family Materia Medica*, with Receipts for preparing all the Family Medicines in common use, with directions how to use them, and about thirty plates, mostly of medicinal plants, with their description, medical properties, and uses. Recipes for preparing Tooth Powders, Cologne Waters, and Medicines for Cleansing and Beautifying the Skin, and many other recipes, useful to Farmers and Mechanics: recipes for preparing and using the remedies for the cure of the Poisons of *Arsenic, Copper, Lead, Mercury, Opium, Morphine, Gallic and Prussic Acids*; also, directions for preparing a variety of Diet for the Sick. The work is got up in the most fashionable style, with marble edges, and bound in fine leather, with spring back, especially for the use of families. The whole is contained in 941 royal octavo pages, and will be delivered to subscribers at *Five Dollars* per copy.

Recommendations from the Medical Faculty of the University of Louisville.

LOUISVILLE, August, 1847.

Dear Sir—Having bestowed on an attentive examination of your "FAMILY PRACTICE" all the leisure I can command, I am of the opinion that, with the addition of the word WELL, which I shall take the liberty of making, I cannot better characterize it than you yourself have done, in your very modest and appropriate title-page, "A Plain System of Medical Practice, WELL adapted to the use of Families."

The work appears to me to be thus adapted, for the following reasons:—

1. The matter it contains is sound and judicious, and sufficiently full and diversified for all the cases of disease in which families themselves should attempt to employ it. When more is needed, recourse should be had to professional aid.

2. The descriptions of diseases are generally correct, and their changes and stages well marked; and the style of the work is so simple and perspicuous, that no one at all acquainted with the English composition can misapprehend its meaning.

3. The compass of the work, embracing as it does every form of disease which an American Physician, in full practice, can expect to encounter in a lifetime, is sufficiently ample.

Wishing it, therefore, the reception and circulation, to which it appears to me to be entitled, I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CH. CALDWELL, M. D.,
Professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence.

P. S. Were it not that comparisons are apt to be held exceptionable, I would not hesitate to say, that I consider your "FAMILY PRACTICE" the most valuable work of the sort of which I have any knowledge. C. C.

BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE.

I have examined Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE," and feel assured that it is, on the whole, well adapted to the purpose for which it is written. I think the work is calculated to be eminently useful S. D. GROSS, M. D., Professor of Surgery.
August, 1847.

I concur in the estimate expressed above by Dr. Gross.
H. MILLER, M. D.,
Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE" with some care, and find that it is plainly written, and contains much that is valuable. I believe the work is calculated to do much good. J. COBB, M. D., Professor of Anatomy.

I have examined Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE," and find it what it purports to be—a plain system of Medical Practice—which I can conscientiously recommend to families. L. P. YANDELL, M. D., Professor of Physiology.

From Practising Physicians in Louisville.

I have examined with care Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE," and find it a valuable work, well suited to the use of Planters and Families. It is plain and comprehensive, and the treatment conformable to the latest and most approved practice, and it affords me much pleasure to recommend it to the public. J. C. GUNN, M. D.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE." The work is not only the result of long experience, but a very judicious selection of the latest and most approved Medical authors, and will, no doubt, be of great service to families. W C. GALT, M. D.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE," and do most unhesitatingly recommend it as a plain, practical work—useful to families. C. PIRTLE, M. D.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE," and take great pleasure in recommending it as a valuable work, suitable to the use of Families. Having practised Medicine fifteen years in Mississippi and Louisiana, I view this work as better adapted to the diseases of that region than any work of the kind I have ever seen.
RICHARD ANGEL, M. D.

We have examined Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE," and feel no hesitation in recommending it to the public, as a book containing a variety of useful and valuable information. It is entirely practical in its designs; all technicalities are avoided, so as to render the author's meaning clear and plain to the unprofessional reader, for whom it is more particularly intended than for the profession, though the latter, and particularly the medical student, might increase his store of practical knowledge by a careful perusal of its pages. Dr. Bright's instruments for the application of caustic to the mouth of the uterus are ingenious, and no doubt will save the practitioner much trouble, and the patient a great deal of unnecessary pain. U. E. EWING, M. D.
Louisville, June, 1847. W. T. H. WINLOCK, M. D.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE," and find in it plain and important practical principles in medicine, well adapted to the use of families.
WM. A. McDOWELL, M. D.

I have examined "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE," and take pleasure in recommending it to all persons as a valuable work—in particular to families in the country.
Louisville, June, 1847 J. W. KNIGHT, M. D.

We have examined the medical work written by J. W. Bright, and take pleasure in recommending it to the public, as a work well calculated for the use of families.
JOHN M. TALBOT, M. D.
Louisville, June 18, 1847. W. H. WAKEFIELD, M. D.

Dr. BRIGHT: Dear Sir—I have looked into your work at such moments as my urgent labors for the season would afford me. It appears to be a work of great research, and is doubtless one of high merit. It is my wish that the reading public may be most thoroughly satisfied of the high appreciation put upon it. B. W. DUDLEY, M. D.,
Lexington, Ky., Feb. 5, 1848. Prof. of Surgery in Transylvania University.

BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE.

From Physicians in Memphis.

After a careful examination of Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE," I have no hesitation in saying, that the practical precepts recommended by the Author are better adapted to the treatment of disease, as it prevails at the Southwest, than any other work of a similar character, with which I am acquainted. GEO. R GRANT, M. D.,
Professor of Theory and Practice of Medicine in the Memphis Medical College.

From the cursory examination which I have been enabled to make of Dr. Bright's work on the Practice of Physic, I have no hesitation in saying, that it is the best production of its kind now published. R. F. WATKINS, M. D
Memphis, Sept. 1, 1847.

We have examined Dr. Bright's "PLAIN SYSTEM OF MEDICAL PRACTICE," and are satisfied that it is better calculated for a safe guide to Families—especially those remote from a scientific physician—than any other work on Domestic Practice. We can therefore cheerfully recommend it as a plain and valuable work; in the main, well adapted to the purposes designed. LEWIS SHANKS, M. D.
Memphis, Sept. 1, 1847. JNO. E. FRAYSER, M. D.

From Physicians in Illinois.

Having been requested to examine "BRIGHT'S FAMILY PRACTICE," I have satisfied myself that it is superior to any work of the kind which has met my notice, both in its description of diseases and principles of treatment. HENRY WING, M. D.,
March 6, 1848. Prof. of Mat. Med., in Jacksonville Med. Coll., Ill.

TO THE PUBLIC.—Having examined Dr. Bright's "FAMILY PRACTICE OF MEDICINE" attentively, I have no hesitation in stating, that it is the best work of the kind now extant, in the English language, and is admirably adapted to the wants of western people.
Lexington, Morgan Co., Ill., March 8, 1848 C. H. KNIGHT, M. D.

BRIGHT'S PRACTICE

IS EMPHATICALLY THE BOOK FOR EVERY FAMILY IN THE UNITED STATES.

☞**AGENTS WANTED** in every county of each State. Very large profits are allowed, and energetic men have made from $500 to $2,000 per annum by selling BRIGHT'S PRACTICE.

A Cash Capital of Eighty or One Hundred Dollars is reqnisite, as the Publishers sell exclusively for cash, to avoid charging an extra profit on those who pay, to make up for losses from those who do not pay. Consequently, in no case will books be forwarded WITHOUT THE MONEY IN HAND. Persons wishing to have an agency, will address the Publishers.

MORTON & GRISWOLD, Publishers,
LOUISVILLE, KY.

Goodrich's Fifth School Reader.

384 pages, 12mo.

1. This work, formerly the Fourth Reader, having been revised, improved, and enlarged to nearly double its former contents, is now the Fifth Reader.

2. By means of a large page, as large, in fact, as an ordinary octavo page, with clear, compact type, and a neat arrangement, nearly twice the matter is given of ordinary works, at same price.

3. An exercise in Spelling and Defining precedes each lesson. This exercise contains the words that the learner is least likely to know. The definitions of upwards of three thousand words, in the sense in which they are used in the context, are found in this and the preceding book.

4. The lessons afford a selection of the very best extracts in the English language, and comprise more than usual of the highest efforts of modern and living masters.

5. It contains an ample number of pages devoted to rules and exercises in Elocution.

6. By a new arrangement, the sequence of the lessons has been made more uniformly progressive.

7. The interests of religion, morality, and good manners, have always been carefully considered in the selection.

S. G. Goodrich's Primary Historical Series.

FIVE VOLS., EACH 216 pp., 18mo.

Parley's Primary History of North America, comprising the United States, with notices of Mexico, Canada, &c.
Parley's Primary History of South America.
Parley's Primary History of Europe
Parley's Primary History of Africa, in preparation.
Parley's Primary History of Asia, including BIBLE HISTORY, in prep.

These handsome little books form a series of primary histories. The mechanical execution is very creditable to the publishers. The following peculiarities render them especially *suitable for beginners*, for whose use they are intended.

The remarkable abundance and beauty of the pictorial illustrations.
The use of maps in the text, thus uniting geography with history.
The striking simplicity and force of the style, which is also chaste and finished.
The freshness with which all the topics are invested.
The introduction of new material, wanting not only in ordinary school books, but even in elaborate historical works.

NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION

OF THE

CHRISTIAN PSALMIST,

A COLLECTION OF TUNES AND HYMNS

For the use of Worshipping Assemblies and Sunday Schools.

NUMERAL EDITION.—Compiled from many Authors, by SILAS W. LEONARD and A. D. FILLMORE. Revised by Rev. WM. GUNN, of Ky., Rev. THOS. HARRISON, of Ohio, and by the AUTHORS.

It is therefore both a Hymn Book and Tune Book in one.

Bound in Sheep, or Extra Cloth,	75 cts.	Bound in Super Gilt Cloth	$1 25
" Morocco, gilt,	$1 00	" Turkey Gilt Cloth	2 00

BUTLER'S
SCHOOL GRAMMARS.

The Series consists of Two Parts,

I. BUTLER'S INTRODUCTORY LESSONS IN ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—For Beginners.

II. BUTLER'S PRACTICAL GRAMMAR.

Instead of offering to the public their own commendations of these books, the publishers have the pleasure of inviting attention to the following communications:

1. From Rev. J. M'CLINTOCK, D.D., who is well known throughout the United States as one of the most accomplished scholars and skilful educators. As a professor in the highest institutions of learning, as the author of a most successful series of classical text books, and as editor of the Quarterly Review, published by the Northern Methodist Episcopal Church, in the city of New York, his reputation is as wide as the country.

"BUTLER'S 'PRACTICAL GRAMMAR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE,' is an exceedingly well-conceived and well-executed book. It is scientific, not only in its groundwork (which every elementary book ought to be), but also in its practical methods and devices, where empiricism is too often substituted for science. As every lesson can be put to use at once, the learner makes real progress with every page. I have seen no Elementary English Grammar that pleases me better—or so well.

JOHN M'CLINTOCK.

New York, March 28, 1849.

2. From GEORGE B. EMERSON, of Boston, whose commendation of any text book is conclusive evidence of its great merits. He stands foremost among the men to whom New England looks up, as the highest authority in all matters connected with education.

Dear Sir—I have hardly had an hour since I received your note accompanying this Grammar, which was not absolutely bespoken for some other purpose. On looking over the book rapidly, I see many things in it which are excellent. The definitions are remarkably simple and clear; the rules are short and comprehensive; and the arrangement is so good, and the exercises so well selected, that a tolerable teacher might be very successful in teaching the principles of English Grammar by the aid of it. It forms, moreover, in the way it is intended to be used, what every Grammar for beginners ought to form—an introduction to the art and practice of composition.

The names of the tenses are far more sensible and philosophical than those found in most Grammars, which indeed are often quite wrong and absurd; and the principles of Syntax and of Prosody are singularly well condensed, without becoming too abstract and obscure. In a future edition, I hope he will give the same condensation to the rules for Punctuation.

I am, dear sir, very truly yours,

Oct. 27, 1845. GEO. B. EMERSON.

To J. G. Palfrey, LL.D., D.D., Secretary of State.

3. The following are extracts from the opinions of distinguished scholars:—

From E. D. North, Prof. of Rhetoric in Yale College.
"It is the most scholarly and philosophic Grammar that I know."

A. D. Lord, of Ohio.
"I consider it one of the best works we have on the subject."

Rev. B. P. Aydelote, of Cincinnati.
"An improvement, in every respect, upon preceding works."

Rich. H. Lee, Prof. Washington Coll.
"I heartily recommend it as the best now to be got."

John Lewis, of Llangollen.
"It is really what its title indicates—A Practical Grammar."

Jno. B. L. Soule, Terre Haute.
"Far in advance of any now in use."

E. A. Smith, Sup't of Common Schools, Statetown, N. Y.
"I prefer it before Brown's and Bullions'."

Moses Soule, North Bridgton.
"My beau ideal of an English Grammar."

BRONSON'S

SYSTEM OF ELOCUTION,

OR,

Mental and Vocal Philosophy, for the Development of the Mind and Body.

COMPRISING

1. *Two or Three Hundred of the Choicest Anecdotes in our Language.*
2. *Three Thousand Oratorical and Poetical Readings and Recitations.*
3. *Five Thousand Proverbs, Maxims, Sayings, Themes, and Laconics.*
4. *And Several Hundred Elegant Engravings, to Illustrate the Work.*

IT CONTAINS:

I. All the Principles of Elocution, in accordance with Physiological and Mental Science: II. SIX FULL LENGTH VIEWS of the Nerves of Organic Life, of Respiration, of the Nerves of Sense and Motion, and of all the Muscles and Bones of the whole Body, clothed and unclothed: III. Natural and Deformed Chests. Positions of Ladies and Gentlemen, of their Bodies, Hands, Arms, and Feet, and ONE HUNDRED Full Length Oratorical and Poetical Portraits: IV. FORTY-FOUR MOUTHS, showing every position to produce the FORTY-FOUR sounds of our Language: V. The Common, and New Mode of Learning the Letters, of Spelling, and of Teaching Children to Read, involving the Science of Phonology: VI. Several Hundred Jaw or Muscle-Breakers, for Training the Voice, while "Laughter holds both of his sides." VII. FIFTY ENGRAVINGS, exhibiting all the Phases of Passion, with appropriate examples to illustrate them: VIII An immense number of Questions and Subjects suggested for Lyceums, Debating Societies, and Social Parties: IX. The largest and best collection of READINGS, RECITATIONS, and DECLAMATIONS, including those interspersed with his Popular Lectures, involving every variety of Thought and Feeling, and ranging from the deepest Tragedy to the highest Comedy; with something on every page, calculated to make one serious and gay: X. By being printed in double columns, and certain kinds of type, it is designed, on philosophical principles, to facilitate the arts of Reading, Memorizing, and the Preservation of the Eyesight—three important points of attainment: XI. It is expressly prepared for use in all SCHOOLS, ACADEMIES, and COLLEGES, Male and Female; and also with particular reference to Private Readers and Learners: XII. In a word, it is just such a book, as every one, having heard of it, will Feel and Think he must have, and cannot do without it.

ITS COMPARATIVE MERITS.

I. An examination of its Contents, and their Arrangement, will enable one to institute a comparison between this work, and all others on the same subject.

II. It is in perfect harmony with what is known of all that is NATURAL, HUMAN, and DIVINE.

III. Its foundations are deeply laid in the Philosophy of Mind and Voice—Spirit and Matter; and the principles are of a far-reaching and comprehensive nature, tending to produce a great revolution in the Art of Reading and Speaking with Science and Effect, and the development of the WHOLE MAN, Soul, Mind, and Body.

IV. Its method is that of ANALYSIS and SYNTHESIS, and is altogether Progressive and Practical in its characteristics.

V. Although but ONE Elocutionary Principle is presented, specifically, on any page, yet each Elementary page contains, incidentally, ALL the Principles of Elocution.

VI. These Principles have never been known to fail, when faithfully applied, to enable one to Read, Speak, and Blow on Wind Instruments, for hours in succession, without Hoarseness, or injurious Exhaustion; and they tend to the Preservation from, and Cure of Diseases of the Throat and Lungs, Dyspepsia, and other Complaints incidental to Public Speaking, and a Sedentary Life.

VII. It is BEAUTIFULLY and SUBSTANTIALLY got up in the octavo form, of between three and four hundred pages, and includes a greater variety of Prose and Poetry than any other system of Elocution, and contains DOUBLE the amount of reading matter found in any similar work in the United States, and yet—THE PRICE IS ONLY ONE DOLLAR.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

Form 419

MAR 2 2 1928